

supplies. Our procedures for following defense-rated orders adequately confirm this view, although despite this fact we are planning some procedural changes which should give us even closer supervision.

The end of it all is that there just is not enough nickel available to take care of defense requirements and the civilian economy (the stockpile take will be substantially decreased this year). The controls which you urge will not get anybody any more nickel and the undoubted result of such controls would probably bring into operation use determinations and specifically might very well result in the complete elimination of the use of nickel for decorative purposes.

There is some further increase of nickel supply in sight for 1957. What effect it will have on civilian availability will largely depend on the military requirements at that time.

This in a general way seems to me to be the story and, as aforesaid, if you find yourself in Washington, we'll be glad to go through it with you to the *nth* degree and give you all of our thinking about a problem which is very difficult and, as I presently see it, almost completely insolvable.

Most sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend John Prescott Robertson, minister, First Congregational Church, Braintree, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who speakest to Thy creation in the glory of the dawn and in the holy hush of eventide, speak to us now as we pause in prayer at noonday to invoke Thy guidance and Thy divine blessing.

Problems face us here, in committee rooms and in our offices, that try the limits of our wisdom; tasks abound that summon up the full measure of our strength; demands galore call for patience and endurance of the highest order. Amidst these stark realities we rejoice in our responsibilities and our opportunities for Thou, O God, changeless and eternal, art the sole source of peace and righteousness.

Wilt Thou be graciously pleased to look upon us now with Thy most holy favor and Thy fatherly benediction. So may we ever realize that while we are toilers in time we are likewise builders for eternity. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., April 18, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
President pro tempore.

### Veterans of Foreign Wars Honor Hon. Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am pleased to inform the House that Mr. Rutherford Day, chairman, Loyalty Day Committee, Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D. C., announced today that my colleague Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has been unanimously selected from a group of all outstanding leaders, including Senators and Congressmen, to receive the annual Loyalty Day award given by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Day stated that this award is made annually to a figure of national prominence who works in the District of Columbia and that this is the first time that the award has been made to a Member of Congress, either on the Senate or House side. The award consists of a plaque, with the following inscription:

To VICTOR WICKERSHAM for exhibiting those qualities in private and public life which make for a greater America.

In advising Congressman WICKERSHAM of his selection to receive the annual Loyalty Day award on May 1, Mr. Day stated:

It is the unanimous opinion of the committee, which opinion is concurred in by the Department of the District of Columbia, that no finer a man could be found to whom the award might be made. By Congressman WICKERSHAM's sincere application to duty and to the interests of his congressional district, as well as to those of the Nation, and with a solid record of achievement in committee and other work, he has proven to be the type of man who is the basic strength of our great United States of America.

Mr. CLEMENTS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 16, 1956, was dispensed with.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 16, 1956,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 17, 1956, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill placed on the calendar.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 7426. An act to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 7732. An act to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9424. An act to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers;

H. R. 9768. An act relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii;

H. R. 9769. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds;

H. R. 10046. An act to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were

signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and a joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 7426. An act to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 9768. An act relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii; and

H. R. 9769. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 7732. An act to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9424. An act to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers; and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10046. An act to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 18, 1956, he pre-

sented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which began its hearing this morning on the proposed judicial appointment of Mr. William B. Herlands to the District Court, Southern District of New York, was unable to finish its hearing this morning. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may continue its hearing this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce having under consideration Senate bill 2643, to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States by encouraging maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources of power, including atomic energy, coal, oil, natural gas, and water, and for other purposes, was authorized to meet this afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to sit tomorrow afternoon while the Senate is in session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Arkansas is in attendance at that subcommittee meeting, will he be willing to look into the matter of the interest rates on housing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be delighted if the Senator from Arkansas will do so.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] be assigned to service on the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Committee on Public Works.

#### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON THURSDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement I should like to make for the information of the Senate, and I call the attention of the minority leader to the request I am about to make. I request unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately following the completion of morning business, there be a call of the unobjected-to-measures on the calendar, and that the call begin at the point where the last calendar call ended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have all Members of the Senate on notice that calendar No. 1780, H. R. 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill, will be taken up on next Monday, April 23. That bill is ready to be considered now, but in view of the provision of the Reorganization Act requiring that appropriation bills lie over for 3 days, the bill could not be brought up until the end of the week. In order that every Senator may have ample time to study it, it is the plan of the leadership to schedule it for April 23. It is my understanding that this is a noncontroversial bill and that it provides for a total appropriation of \$433,851,400, which is \$1,290,900 less than was requested by the Budget Bureau.

I might also mention, for the information of the Senate, that last year the Interior Department appropriation bill was reported to the Senate on May 2 and was passed on May 5. As of this time, the Senate has completed action on 4 appropriation bills this year, 3 of which have become public laws—the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957, the urgent deficiency, and the additional Labor appropriation for 1956. The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1956 will soon be out of conference, and I am sure will be finally completed at an early date.

Last year at this time the Senate had acted upon 3 appropriation bills, only 1 of which had become a public law; so it is clear that we are substantially ahead of schedule this year. I know that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses are moving forward on their heavy workload expeditiously and vigorously. I am confident that final action on all appropriation bills will be completed well ahead of schedule this year.

I should like to give notice that following the morning business it is planned to take up the following measures:

Calendar No. 1749, S. 2424, to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be



known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam;

Calendar No. 1750, S. 2712, a bill to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremer-ton, Wash.;

Calendar No. 1751, S. 2091, authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.;

Calendar No. 1752, S. 2092, transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal;

Calendar No. 1753, S. 3272, to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948;

Calendar No. 1776, H. R. 9428, to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1777, S. 2854, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

Calendar No. 1778, S. 2855, to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes; and

Calendar No. 1779, S. 2859, to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes.

As I have previously announced, on Thursday there will be a call of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, so that we can clear the calendar of private bills which are ready to be considered.

I also wish to announce that the three treaties on the Executive Calendar will be considered on Thursday, immediately following the morning business.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

##### AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3238 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Attorney General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Henry H. Ettinger, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide old-age assistance to honorably discharged veterans of World War I, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact certain legislation

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary for establishing proper flood-control measures in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; reducing the age at which women may receive benefits under the Social Security Act from 65 to 62; reducing the age at which widows may receive such benefits from 65 to 62; reducing the eligibility age of persons entitled to old-age assistance to 60 years; providing for a study of the number of Veterans' Administration general medical and general surgical hospital beds within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with a view to increasing such facilities; providing that paid-up policies of insurance be issued to such veterans of World War I who have paid into the Treasury of the United States premiums in excess of the amount of the face value of such term policies and that thereafter all premiums thereon shall be waived; providing for two deliveries of mail daily by the post office department; providing that a pension of not less than \$100 be paid monthly to citizens who are over the age of 65 and have retired; providing that no concession be granted on the import of textiles from foreign countries; granting loans to private and public utilities so that they may place all cables and lines underground as a precautionary measure against the effect of storms and hurricanes; establishing a system of disaster insurance to protect against loss or damage of homes and industries caused by flood, hurricane, or other disaster; providing for the construction of Federal housing projects in the west, south and north end sections of the city of Boston; providing for the establishment of a national health insurance plan; repealing the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act; and enacting an immigration act in which there shall be no quota system based on national origins; granting aid in the form

of arms to the government of Israel; preventing racial discrimination and to see that such laws are enforced, particularly in certain Southern States; establishing a program of Federal grants to States or political subdivisions thereof as an aid to education, whereby the reimbursement or payment of a specific sum be made to each student being provided with formal education; incorporating the Franco-American War Veterans; and pertaining to the repeal of a treaty relative to the prosecution of members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries for alleged violations of the law of such countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to ensure that the Postmaster General issue a postage stamp in memory of the late Herman Melville, author of Moby Dick, the classic American novel of the sea and the whaling industry, and a postage stamp commemorating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

#### LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF LIMA, OHIO, TRAFFIC CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Lima Traffic Club, of Lima, Ohio, signed by Eugene A. Jackson, secretary, transmitting a resolution adopted by that club, relating to amendment of the Administrative Procedures Act.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMA TRAFFIC CLUB,  
Lima, Ohio, April 6, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Judiciary Committee,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Lima Traffic Club, Lima, Ohio, has adopted the enclosed resolution which is submitted for your favorable consideration.

Most respectfully,

EUGENE A. JACKSON,  
Secretary.

Whereas the Lima Traffic Club, composed of more than 195 representatives of shippers, railroads, motor, air, and water carriers, by its board of governors in regular session at Lima, Ohio, on March 21, 1956, has considered the provisions of bills H. R. 6114 and S. 2541, covering a proposed "Administrative Code," now pending before the Congress and which are designed to make drastic changes in the laws governing administrative agency procedures; and

Whereas there is no public demand for changes in the present Administrative Procedures Act as concerns administrative processes under said act, as is amply supported by the fact that such changes were not approved by six members of the special Hoover Committee, including the Attorney General, who stated: "We did not vote for these recommendations (Nos. 29 to 48) because of their possible consequences and possible increase in expenditures of the Government"; and

Whereas it is the considered judgment of the officers and members of the board of governors of this organization that the provisions of these bills would do injury to the general public by way of increased cost in handling and retarded disposition of matters before administrative agencies and, at

the same time, destroy practices and procedures developed over a long period of time; and

Whereas among the many changes proposed by these bills are provisions which would make unlawful practice by qualified persons, other than attorneys-at-law, before administrative agencies and also void existing authority, for instance, of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate practice before it; and

Whereas under existing authority the Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, permits employees of shippers to appear for their own concerns and has fixed standards of education and experience for those appearing in a representative capacity, who must offer proof by test of their qualifications; and

Whereas the traffic and transportation profession is highly specialized where legal training, as the term is used in legal circles, is not a requisite to practice before certain administrative agencies who treat, in particular, traffic and transportation matters, but may be of assistance to said agencies only when combined with and used in conjunction with knowledge of traffic and transportation gained by practical experience in the field. In this connection Attorney General Brownell said, in effect, "It follows that those who make a specialty of such work are entitled to greater weight than is accorded to a nonspecialized person," and to require confinement of practice before such administrative agencies to attorneys-at-law would be not only unwise, but also inefficient, more costly, discriminatory and unreasonable; and

Whereas the Lima Traffic Club and other similar organizations have sponsored education in the field of traffic and transportation for many years and interest therein is great with result that a number of institutions of higher learning now offer a major in traffic and transportation and show a growing enrollment therein, all of which would be seriously retarded, if not destroyed, by the enactment of these bills and thereby do injury to both students and their employers; and

Whereas it is clear the provisions of these bills would hamper administration by agencies, created by the Congress to function in its behalf, and require substitution of judicial processes for legislative functions; and

Whereas the interest of the public in matters considered by administrative agencies far outweighs that of any special class and any legislation which would require such agencies to permit only certain persons to practice before them, regardless of qualifications and by changing procedures developed by experience for efficient handling, is to be condemned as detrimental to the general welfare: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Lima Traffic Club records its opposition to bills H. R. 6114 and S. 2541 as being unsound and contrary to the public interest and they should not be enacted; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the area represented by this organization and to members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Adopted March 21, 1956.

LIMA TRAFFIC CLUB,

LIMA, OHIO,

HARRY SHRINER,

*President.*

J. D. STAPLETON,

*Vice President.*

A. W. MORTON,

*Treasurer.*

E. A. JACKSON,

*Secretary.*

D. C. O'CONNOR,

C. M. CREIGHTON,

HAROLD H. BALK,

*Members, Board of Governors.*

## RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 863, the Water Rights Settlement Act of 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been the settled rule of law for nearly a century that water rights in Midwestern and Western States are determined by State law, and not otherwise; and

Whereas it has also been the established rule that control and jurisdiction over the waters of streams and rivers have been vested in the several States subject to whatever control the Federal Government has found necessary to exercise in the case of navigable waters in its regulation of navigation under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas section 210 of the constitution of North Dakota provides that "all flowing streams and natural water courses shall forever remain the property of the State for mining, irrigation, and manufacturing purposes," and section 61-0101 of the North Dakota Revised Code, as amended, provides that "all waters within the limits of the State belong to the public and are subject to appropriation for beneficial use," and

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent *Pelton* case, which virtually divested the State of Oregon of complete jurisdiction over the waters of the Deschutes River, a nonnavigable stream therein, threatens to jeopardize and impair the control of States in granting and adjudicating rights to the beneficial use of the waters of their streams: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, in meeting regularly assembled this 9th day of March 1956*, That Congress be, and is hereby urged, to definitely and unambiguously recognize the right and jurisdiction of the several States in and to the waters of streams and natural watercourses therein by speedily enacting into law Senate bill 863 proposed by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, and thereby settle for all time, and beyond question, that the control, use, distribution, and appropriation of the waters of streams and rivers is vested in the States, and not otherwise; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator BARRETT and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

## PREDICAMENT OF THE INDIANS— RESOLUTION OF CASS COUNTY (MINN.) WELFARE BOARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have frequently directed the Senate's attention to the serious predicament faced by our American Indians, particularly those in my own State of Minnesota. In some cases the situation during the past winter became critical. For that reason, I have been watching the resolutions from Minnesota county welfare agencies with particular attention. One such resolution has just arrived from the Cass County Welfare Board of Walker, Minn., and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On December 9, 1955, a meeting was held with regard to Indians. There were four counties represented at this meeting; namely, Beltrami, Cass, Mahanomen, and Becker. Several areas of the Indian problem were discussed.

1. It appeared that the most immediate problem for the care of Indians was financial, and in discussing this problem several areas were discovered in variance.

(a) There appears to be a variation in the methods of reimbursement. It was discovered that Becker County had been, up until January 1, 1955, reimbursed 100 percent for Indian costs where the other counties had not been.

(b) Employment opportunities in all four counties was limited with respect to hiring Indian labor.

(c) Very indefinite policies were discovered as it pertained to the medical care for Indians. Since July 1, Indian Service medical care is under the supervision or administered by the United States Public Health Service and seems to be confined to medical needs which might occur on tribal lands. University hospital care or other related services would not be provided by the United States Public Health Service.

2. There were several items on which the four counties agreed that were represented at this meeting.

(a) It was mutually agreed the Indians are yet the responsibility of the Federal Government, and if they withdraw this responsibility it then becomes the responsibility of the State of Minnesota. Not any of the counties in which the Indians reside could assume the full responsibility for their support.

(b) The financial responsibility of the State or Federal Government to the counties involved should be on not less than 100-percent reimbursement basis.

(c) This reimbursement should be for all money expended for the care of Indians.

(d) All Indians to be eligible for reimbursement when they are found to be in need and aid is provided for them.

(e) The State of Minnesota should take the initiative to explore all avenues for the permanent solution to the Indian problem with the cooperation of all counties involved.

(f) That this report be presented to Mr. Morris Hursh, commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Minnesota.

3. The recommendations made for financing are to meet the current situation. They are not intended as a solution to the Indian problem and for this reason some are made toward long-term planning.

(a) The continuation and expansion of the relocation project which is Federal and asking that closer cooperation with the welfare department be utilized.

(b) Studies made for permanent employment opportunities be made available in all reservation counties for Indians.

(c) That an honest effort be made in the settlement of Indian claims, an honest determination if they do have a claim, and that the Indian be informed of his status with this regard once and for all.

4. Summary: What has been submitted by the group is not in itself an all-inclusive report. It merely represents the thinking of the four counties, mainly of immediate needs. It was recognized the Indian problem cannot be solved by one agency alone. It will require the leadership of the State department of public welfare, together with the other State agencies who are concerned with the financial, educational, health, social, and moral factors for the well being and improvement of this minority group within our State. No single agency can meet this



problem but it is by a long-range program with Federal and State funds and the support of all agencies involved you make great strides in improving the Indian's lot.

#### RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL CHAPTER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the St. Paul Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans adopted a resolution urging the Veterans' Administration to convert the Veterans' Administration Annex at Fort Snelling into a domiciling and nursing hospital. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACTION TAKEN BY ST. PAUL CHAPTER, DAV, AT REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 13, 1956

Whereas the Veterans' Administration is planning to evacuate the Veterans' Administration Annex at Fort Snelling; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration now has no domiciliary facility in this area to care for such terminal cases as heart, cancer, arthritis, or other lingering diseases; and

Whereas it is believed that Fort Snelling Annex can be converted into domiciliary and nursing hospital at nominal cost: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That St. Paul Chapter, Disabled American Veterans, does earnestly endorse and support the resolution of Minneapolis Chapter, Disabled American Veterans, to urge the Veterans' Administration to accomplish such conversion in order that the many disabled veterans in this area, who are in dire need of such domiciliary care, and are now forced to rely on charity for such care that charity provides may receive the care and treatment that they are rightfully entitled to; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Minnesota Senators and congressional Representatives with an urgent request that they lend their support to the effort to establish such domiciliary and nursing hospital at Fort Snelling Annex.

JOHN F. KALLAND, PDC,

Chairman.

A. M. HERRIGES, PDC.

LAWRENCE J. FOLEY, PCC.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 3338. A bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects (Rept. No. 1764).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2822. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District Numbered 8, Mohave County, Ariz. (Rept. No. 1762).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3515. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 1777).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 924. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law (Rept. No. 1767); and

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Allison MacBride (Rept. No. 1783).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 2854. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government (Rept. No. 1768).

By Mr. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2498. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument (Rept. No. 1776).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2305. A bill to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to authorize their disposal as surplus Federal property (Rept. No. 1770);

S. 2512. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces (Rept. No. 1784);

S. 3254. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States (Rept. No. 1771);

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla. (Rept. No. 1772);

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service (Rept. No. 1773); and

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians (Rept. No. 1769).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1053. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion, in order to authorize the renewal of such lease (Rept. No. 1773);

S. 2144. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Incorporated (Rept. No. 1775); and

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1785).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2517. A bill to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska (Rept. No. 1778);

H. R. 6162. A bill to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii (Rept. No. 1779); and

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the

compensation of Supreme Court Justices and circuit court judges (Rept. No. 1780).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 4047. A bill relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1781).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 4781. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1782).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 239. Resolution to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 238. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 1734 on welfare and pensions funds.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 8957. A bill to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1786).

#### REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, and I submit a report (No. 1787) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. President, there have been so many requests for copies of this report that I ask unanimous consent that 5,000 copies of the report on the retirement bill be furnished the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Because of the unprecedented demand for this information the committee feels that this request is necessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF PROPERTIES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report, favorably, an original bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1763) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3673) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

#### CITATION OF MARY KNOWLES FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Mary Knowles, and I submit a report (No. 1765) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify, under the Seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mary Knowles, before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, to answer questions pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, to the end that the said Mary Knowles may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

#### CITATION OF HERMAN LIVERIGHT FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report, favorably, an original resolution certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Herman Liveright, and I submit a report (No. 1766) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify, under the Seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Herman Liveright, before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, to answer questions pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, to the end that the said Herman Liveright may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

#### MARY MARGARET O'HARA

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay,

from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret O'Hara, widow of Robert E. O'Hara, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### RENA V. PELLEGRINI

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 243), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Rena V. Pellegrini, widow of Frank Pellegrini, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### RUTH M. HAEFNER

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 244), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ruth M. Haefner, daughter of Florence R. McKeever, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 245), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the revised edition of Senate Document No. 97 of the 82d Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook" be printed as a Senate document.

#### PRINTING OF ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the 58th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1955, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3646. A bill to prevent racketeering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3647. A bill for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3648. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans) to authorize additional financial assistance in connection with public projects made necessary by certain activities related to the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3649. A bill to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3650. A bill for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 3651. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources, and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3652. A bill to provide for the extension of rural mail delivery service; and

S. 3653. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to conduct an investigation and survey to determine the number of residences not now receiving direct-to-home mail service and to recommend methods and means of providing such rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3654. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3655. A bill to amend section 172 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the net operating loss deduction in the case of taxable years beginning in 1953 and ending in 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3656. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and for sector headquarters for the Immigration Border Patrol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 3657. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3658. A bill to amend the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347) so as to authorize,



by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 3659. A bill to provide for the liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation's surplus stocks of agricultural commodities, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3660. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Paganis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 3661. A bill to establish an acreage allotment for 1956 for corn in the commercial corn-producing area of 51 million acres; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 3662. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3663. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3664. A bill to conform the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3665. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3666. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Englessos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3667. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3668. A bill to provide further protection against the dissemination of diseases of livestock or poultry, and for other purposes; and

S. 3669. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3670. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to permit certain officers and employees of State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WOFFORD):

S. 3671. A bill to prescribe minimum acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 3672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small business concerns to engage in foreign trade; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3673. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; placed on calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he reported the above bill, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3674. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3675. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 3676. A bill relating to cotton acreage allotments and limitations on imports; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3677. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3678. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3679. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3680. A bill to provide a minimum 53 million acreage allotment for corn; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3681. A bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Study Election Finances and Related Aspects of Elections to Federal Offices; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported and placed on the Calendar:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 240. Citing Mary Knowles for contempt of the Senate; and

S. Res. 241. Citing Herman Liveright for contempt of the Senate.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he reported the above resolutions, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 242. To pay a gratuity to Mary Margaret O'Hara;

S. Res. 243. To pay a gratuity to Rena V. Pellegrini;

S. Res. 244. To pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Haefner;

S. Res. 245. To provide for the printing of the revised edition of document entitled "Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document; and

S. Res. 246. To provide for the printing of the annual report of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

(See resolutions printed in full under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## PREVENTION OF RACKETEERING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent racketeering, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, together with a memorandum, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3646) to prevent racketeering, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and memorandum presented by Mr. LANGER are as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

I strongly favor and shall advocate amendments to the Hobbs Act for I believe them essential to the free economy of our people. While I shall always champion all laws restricting force, violence, robbery, and extortion, I shall with equal vigor oppose any unusual rule, unintended and undesirable judicial construction of those laws in situations where they were never meant to apply. The amendments which I favor will carefully preserve all of the drastic criminal pen-

alties to be invoked against persons guilty of robbery or extortion induced by force, violence, or the threats thereof, but will at the same time eliminate the present danger of the Hobbs Act being used as a weapon to destroy the traditional activities or organized labor. The obvious implications of recent judicial decisions construing and applying the provisions of the Hobbs Act are frightening in their possibilities. I deem it essential to guarantee against the possibility, nay, probability, that the economic interests in power in our Government at any one time may avail themselves of the court interpretations of the law as a means of resisting the efforts of the trade labor movement to obtain improved wages, hours, or working conditions. The amendments which I advocate are requisite to a balancing of the inequities which exist between the right of employers to run their businesses free from union interferences and the right of unions to better the wages, hours, and working conditions of their members.

I have always understood that in providing severe penalties for robbery and extortion the Hobbs Act sought to represent those engaged in blackmail and racketeering for their own personal benefit or for the benefit of those acting in concert with them. The legislative history of the act certainly bears me out in this understanding. But by the recent judicial interpretation of the act by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *U. S. v. Green* (No. 54 of March 26, 1956), it now appears that a labor leader may be successfully prosecuted under the act even when it clearly appears that he seeks no personal benefit whatsoever. In the *Green* case, it was successfully contended that the Hobbs Act was violated when the object of the undertaking consisted only in seeking "money, in the form of wages to be paid for imposed, unwanted, superfluous, and fictitious services of laborers commonly known as swamper \* \* \*". I have always understood that it is traditional and legitimate for labor leaders to seek the employment of union members and that it is not even illegal for them to do so under the threat and compulsion of a strike. If personal benefit is not an essential element of the crime of robbery or extortion under the Hobbs Act then it seems to me that leaders of organized labor will be forced to discontinue their efforts to seek employment and improve wages, hours, and working conditions for their members for fear that if someone of the group makes a threat of some kind during the course of the effort or if there is any element of violence whatsoever, those labor leaders will be subjected to imprisonment for 20 years for their activities on behalf of their members. I am convinced that the absence of an amendment requiring that personal benefit or gain be sought by the undertaking will necessarily result in a prosecution of the legitimate activities of trade labor leaders.

Nor is the *Green* case the only judicial example of the unjust and unintended application of the Hobbs Act. In the case of *U. S. v. Kemble* (198 F. 2d 889), the conviction of a labor leader was affirmed where all he sought was to induce the employment of a trucking concern of a competent union helper to do the unloading of said truck, during the course of which he uttered a threat to the driver of the truck and some unknown person let air out of the tires of the truck. During the prosecution of the case the Government conceded that Kemble was not interested in protection money from the trucking concern and took the position, which was concurred in by the majority of the United States Court of Appeals, that even though the purposes of Kemble were to secure work for the members of his union, he would still be guilty under the Hobbs Act if his demand was accompanied by any violence or threats.

I find myself in accord with the dissenting opinions of Judges McLaughlin and Staley in the *Kemble* case. Judge McLaughlin pointed out that the prosecution arose from a reputable union's genuine attempt to organize a trucking corporation, and that the position of Kemble was to procure work for capable union men, whereas the Hobbs Act was directed at blackmail and racketeering. He further observed that if violence occurs in connection with union activities otherwise legitimate, such violence should be left to State supervision.

In a separate dissenting opinion, Judge Staley observed that if the majority opinion were sound law, a union and its officers and members who strike in violation of a no-strike clause or who engage in any strike or picketing for any unlawful purpose, criminal or otherwise, can be indicted, prosecuted, and convicted under the Hobbs Act simply because the strike constitutes the use of force to obtain the property of another.

The foregoing are but a few of the many reasons why it is unjust to extend the scope of the Hobbs Act to activities of union representatives when they are not seeking any personal advantage or gain whatsoever but instead, are merely attempting to better the conditions of their members. Under the interpretation of the law by the courts, legal and legitimate labor activities may become violations of the Hobbs Act through the simple threat of a strike or by the inadvertent and careless threat of some union person. I am convinced that the seeking of personal benefit or gain is essential as an amendment to the act in order to eliminate this problem.

I can conceive of even greater injustices to organized labor under the court interpretations of the act. As written, the act refers to robbery or extortion induced by the means of "wrongful use of actual or threatened \* \* \* fear." The courts have construed fear to mean that it is sufficient for the purposes of the law that an employer be in fear of economic losses to his business resulting from the activity of labor organizations. The courts have even held that the fear need not be actually done or threatened. It is sufficient that an employer be aware of strikes of other employers and even in other industries which might in turn happen in his case should he not accede to the wishes of a union. When this factor is coupled with the reasoning of the United States Supreme Court in the *Green* case to the effect that extortion may consist of the imposition of unwanted, superfluous, and fictitious services, it is easy to see how practically every union which bargains for a contract with every employer is necessarily violating the provisions of the Hobbs Act. For example, a union which is bargaining with an employer may propose that its individuals be employed to do a particular job whereas only one performed that job in the past. Perhaps the union may feel that the work is too heavy for one person or that it is too dangerous for one person to perform. But whatever the reason may be, the fact remains that the additional employee would be unwanted by the employer and perhaps, in the opinion of the employer, superfluous. That being the case, and as the employer must necessarily fear an economic loss to his business if the union strikes in furtherance of its demands, it also follows that those union officials making the demands and acting on behalf of their members may very well serve 20 years in a Federal penitentiary for their efforts.

I do not by any means intend this statement as an exhaustive analysis of my reasons, for supporting amendments to the Hobbs Act. There are numerous other reasons and arguments supporting my position and these are intended only to highlight what I consider to be the two strongest reasons in support of amendments.

#### MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ANTI-RACKETEERING ACT (HOBBS ACT)

The legislative history of title 18, United States Code, section 1951, properly known as the Hobbs Act, demonstrates conclusively that the act was intended by Congress to curtail and render more difficult the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types. That legislative history further shows that it was never the intent of Congress that the act should be used to hamper, interfere with, or restrain in any way legitimate activities of labor unions, and their officers and agents directed toward lawful, legitimate union activities. Notwithstanding such legislative history and congressional intent, union officers and members have been indicted, prosecuted and convicted under the Hobbs Act for activities which had always been considered as lawful and in furtherance of legitimate union aims and objectives. An example of the misinterpretation of the purposes of this act is the case of *United States v. Kemble* (198 F. 2d 889), in which one Aaron Kemble, a business agent for Teamsters Local No. 676 of Camden, N. J., was indicted, prosecuted and convicted under said act, because, in the exercise of his duties as business agent, he sought to induce the employment by a trucking firm of a union helper to do the unloading of a truck, and in so doing uttered a threat to the driver, and at the same time someone let air out of his tires. In this prosecution, the Government conceded that no inference could be drawn that either the union or Kemble was interested in protection money from the trucking concern, but took the position, which was adopted by the majority of the court, that even though the purposes of Kemble were to secure work for members of his union, he would still be guilty, under the Hobbs Act, if the demand was accompanied by any violence or threats. In a dissenting opinion in the *Kemble* case, Judge McLaughlin pointed out that the prosecution arose from a reputable union's genuine attempt to organize a trucking corporation, and that the sole purpose of Kemble was to procure work for capable union men, whereas the Hobbs Act was directed at blackmail and racketeering. He further held that if violence occurs in connection with union activities, such violence or other misconduct should be left to State supervision. In a separate dissenting opinion, issued in the same case, Judge Staley pointed out that if the majority opinion was sound, a union and its officers and members, who struck in violation of a no-strike clause or who were engaged in a strike and picketing for any unlawful purpose, could be indicted, prosecuted and convicted under the Hobbs Act because any strike constitutes the use of force to obtain property of another.

Such a construction of the Hobbs Act as was made by the majority of the court in the *Kemble* case encourages indictments and prosecutions of union officers, engaged in the pursuit in what have long been considered as legitimate union objectives. If such prosecutions and indictments are unchecked, it could well result in officers and members of labor unions being reluctant to engage in any strikes or picketing where interstate commerce is involved, because of the possibility that the purpose thereof may be declared to be unlawful and because violence might ensue as tempers flared.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, deplors the interpretation of the Hobbs Act which has been made by our courts in cases such as the *Kemble* case and calls upon Congress to amend the Hobbs Act so as to remove any possibility that officers or members may be indicted, prosecuted or convicted under said act for activities directed at what have traditionally been



considered as lawful and legitimate union objectives. To this end the proposed draft, which is attached, is submitted.

#### HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to govern hunting, fishing, and trapping on areas under Federal jurisdiction. The bill is aimed particularly at military lands.

This bill was drafted in consultation with the game and fish commissioners and game and fish wardens of the States. It is an improvement over a bill on the same matter which I introduced previously.

The major difference in this bill and the earlier one is that it provides for enforcement of the game, fish, and trapping laws of the States. Specifically, the bill will provide that on Federal lands the fish, game, and trapping laws of the particular State shall apply.

The Senate understands that the game and fish laws of the States are conservation measures. We will apply those regulations to all Federal land where hunting, fishing or trapping is allowed.

The first bill which I introduced on this matter was Senate bill 2777, was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I hope the committee will take no action on Senate bill 2777, but will consider this new bill as a substitute and will proceed to hearings promptly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3649) to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### TOWN OF FREEPORT, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize payment of \$2,500 to the town of Freeport, Maine, by the Federal Government in full satisfaction of the claims of the town of Freeport for Federal compensation for hurricane damage.

During the hurricanes of 1954 a bridge was washed out in the town of Freeport. Under emergency State legislation and Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress the State and Federal Governments would each have borne half of the cost of replacement. The cost of restoration of the washed-out bridge was determined to be \$8,000, so the State of Maine would have paid \$4,000. However, the bridge in question served only a single resident beyond the washout.

After discussion with appropriate officials, the town of Freeport decided to attempt to reduce the sum of \$8,000 by purchasing the property served by the washed-out bridge and then reselling it with a stipulation that the bridge would not be replaced. The town proceeded to

purchase the land for \$10,000 and then sold it, under an agreement with the buyer that he would not require reconstruction of the bridge, for \$5,000. The net deficit then was \$5,000, or \$3,000 less than the cost of replacement of the bridge.

The State of Maine adopted a liberal construction of its disaster-relief laws and reimbursed the town for half the cost of this transaction. The town then submitted an application for Federal reimbursement through the manager of the Civil Defense Disaster Office. This official felt that the claim should be paid, but it was disapproved by the officer in charge of the Maine task force of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and this disapproval was affirmed by Federal civil-defense headquarters. The manager of the Civil Defense Disaster Office stated in a letter to the officer in charge of the Maine task force as follows:

Naturally with this being a roads and bridge project with both State and Federal participation, it was felt that as long as it was agreeable with the State highway commission it would be acceptable with the FCDA.

While the Federal Civil Defense Administration is probably technically correct in its interpretation of the Federal Disaster Act, it would appear that the effect is to penalize the town of Freeport, Maine, for making a commendable effort to reduce disaster losses. Therefore, it is believed that in this instance the relief of a private bill to authorize reimbursement of the town is clearly warranted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3650) for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a soil-bank bill in the precise form in which that program was incorporated in the bill recently passed by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3651) to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks earlier today relative to the soil-bank bill, which I introduced for myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Missis-

issippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and later cosponsored, I believe, by some distinguished Senators from the other side of the aisle, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial bearing on the soil bank which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune. I make that unanimous-consent request.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SAVING THE SOIL BANK

Democratic Party leadership would be well advised to have second thoughts before concluding that they have sure-fire election ammunition in President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill. The President uncompromisingly rejected a hypocritical piece of legislation, but he was not content to rest there. By immediately requesting that the soil bank, the one constructive part of the bill, be enacted independently, the President has returned the responsibility where it belongs.

More important, it shows that the chief concern of the administration is the plight of the American farmers. The soil-bank program would add \$1.2 billion to farm income in return for withdrawing excess acreage from cultivation for conservation purposes. It would thus directly attack the accumulation of gigantic surpluses, which are the basic cause of the farmers' troubles. By a special provision, farmers could benefit substantially from the soil bank this year, even though spring planting has already started in many parts of the country.

The farm bill is effectively dead. What are the chances of congressional approval of the soil bank alone? There had been definite warnings that if Mr. Eisenhower exercised his veto, he would get no farm legislation whatsoever, soil bank or anything else. The influential Democratic Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, put it bluntly 10 days ago: "I don't believe there will be any farm bill this year if this one is vetoed." The idea apparently will be to denounce the President as the farmers' enemy because he refused to approve a bill which even its supporters would hardly maintain was worthy of either the farmers or the country. Such ideas often boomerang. So far the farm reaction to the President's courageous act has been a good deal less negative than his opponents hoped.

Questions of political advantage aside, the problems of American agriculture are still no nearer a national solution. The soil bank, the most positive approach, is once again before Congress. Senators and Representatives have made their political hay; they have gone on record as they saw fit; they have the campaign issues they think they need. There is still time for them to make a genuine contribution toward remedying the Nation's No. 1 economic malady.

#### LIQUIDATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION'S SURPLUS STOCK OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, ETC.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks of agricultural commodities, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an agricultural surplus administrator. I desire to point out that provision for

these three items was contained in the farm bill as it passed the Senate, and in the bill I am now introducing the language which was adopted by the Senate is not changed.

I believe the bill strikes at the problem of the disposal of surpluses, and I hope it will be considered by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3659) to provide for the liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation's surplus stock of agricultural commodities, to amend the Agricultural Trade and Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### CORN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the 1956 corn-acreage allotment at not less than 51 million acres—the amount approved by the Congress in the farm bill vetoed by the President.

Without this legislation, apparently, corn growers will be faced with a 43-million-acre allotment originally ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary knows as well as anyone else that the 43-million-acre allotment will not be complied with. This extreme cutback was ordered, in my opinion, as a deliberate part of efforts to wreck the corn program and create a protest from farmers to take off allotments entirely.

The Secretary and other officials of the Department have already indicated by their testimony before our committees, their willingness to accept a higher level, and have expressed a willingness to accept up to 56 million acres on the basis of originally announced support levels.

Actually, there is no reason why the Secretary cannot himself change this allotment to the 51 million acres, which would permit almost exactly the same individual farm allotments in the commercial corn area as provided last year. Of course, the only reason why he will not change the allotment is that he will not change it; he is just stubborn about it. If he can arbitrarily change support levels after once announcing them, as the President has asked him to do, the Secretary can change the allotment under his discretionary authority to reach a realistic total offering greater chance of compliance.

Fifty-one million acres will not produce as much corn as unlimited production which the Secretary was willing to accept.

The Department appears determined to break down this program instead of make it work.

The \$1.50 support level announced by the President is meaningless if it is based upon such a small allotment no corn-grower will comply with it.

In fact, the administration now indicates it may support all corn at from \$1.21 to \$1.28 regardless of compliance with any allotments, showing they do not expect the 43 million allotment to mean anything.

Such a move rewards farmers who have failed to comply instead of those who have cooperated in keeping production down.

Instead of opening the floodgates to all the corn that can be produced at lower prices, I ask adoption of a 51-million-acre allotment upon which farmers could at least be assured the meager \$1.50 support level this administration is willing to grudgingly give.

Any other course is directly inconsistent and unprincipled. The administration cannot cry about surpluses out of one side of its mouth, then out of the other side of its mouth say that corn shall be completely uncontrolled. The 51-million-acre allotment I have proposed will bring greater compliance, and mean less corn produced than the unrealistic 43-million-acre allotment which nobody will observe.

While I intend to comment at greater length today on the farm-bill veto, I wanted first to move at once to correct this gross inequity and injustice brought about by that veto, on an inconsistent and unprincipled basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3661) to establish an acreage allotment for 1956 for corn in the commercial corn-producing area of 51 million acres, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF AUBURN UNIT, AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from California (Mr. KNOWLAND), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

The bill, if enacted would authorize a multiple-purpose dam on the American River near Auburn, Calif., as a unit of the Central Valley project.

It would also provide 900,000 acre-feet of storage, making available a new supply of irrigation and domestic water for a rapidly growing section of California. This area includes Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado and part of Sutter Counties.

Moreover, the dam will be situated at a point on the American River which will not interfere with the preservation of the site of the discovery of gold. This site is near Coloma, in El Dorado County, and is a shrine for the loyal sons and daughters of California.

The proposed project is based on a study by the Water Resources Board of the State of California. It will be in-

cluded in the California State water plan, which is now under preparation. Introduction of its bill will permit the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with making a report on the project, which is much desired by the State of California.

In addition to water storage, the project will include a 180,000-kilowatt powerplant. I have been advised that the total cost of the project will be between seventy and one hundred million dollars.

The area to be served is both agricultural and industrial. A large part of the pear crop of California is grown there.

The project would be operated in conjunction with the Folsom Dam unit of the Central Valley project as one of the means by which the capital city of my State, Sacramento, and other communities may have adequate protection from the hazard of floods such as those which recently visited California with grievous results.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3662) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE AND COUNTY COMMITTEES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to permit certain officers and employees of State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to extend some of the benefits of civil service to employees of State and county agricultural stabilization committees. It would permit these employees to participate on a voluntary basis in the retirement benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930.

This bill also provides that any person who has served for at least 2 years as an employee of a State or county ASC committee and who is separated from such service shall acquire, upon passing a non-competitive examination, a classified civil-service status. This would permit such an employee to transfer to a position in classified civil service within 1 year following the date of his separation from service with the ASC committee. This provision, Mr. President, is substantially the same as that relating to legislative employees of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have long felt that these Government employees are entitled to at least a portion of the benefits other Government employees enjoy under civil service. This bill would in no way affect



the hiring of people to fill the positions with these committees. It would merely give them retirement benefits plus the right to civil-service status upon leaving the employ of these committees.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3670) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to permit certain officers and employees of State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"This act shall also apply to all regular employees of State and county committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to any such employee until he gives notice in writing to the officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this act. In the case of an employee in the service of such a committee on the date of enactment of this paragraph, such notice of desire must be given within the calendar year 1956. In the case of an employee of such a committee who enters the service after the date of enactment of this paragraph, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of entrance in the service."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 5 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "Pan American Sanitary Bureau," the following: "or as an employee of a State or county committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act."

SEC. 3. Any person who shall have served for at least 2 years as an employee of a State or county committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and who is separated from such service, shall acquire upon passing such suitable noncompetitive examination as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, a classified civil service status for transfer, within 1 year following the date of such separation, to a position in the classified civil service.

#### MINIMUM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the veto of the farm bill by the President leaves us without new legislation so badly needed to assist our farm people. Our farmers are still faced with the most serious problem of our times. They are faced with competition and declining markets, depressed prices, and increased cost of production. The fact that the President has vetoed the farm bill does not eliminate or solve our farm problem.

In the case of cotton, we are now faced with a reduction in price and a reduction in acreage. Our farmers cannot possibly

make ends meet under a program which reduces both volume and price. I believe that we should take a constructive approach to this situation and put together a new bill. From the standpoint of the welfare of our farmers, it is extremely important that legislation be enacted to give some relief to their pressing need.

It is already too late to get the soil bank enacted in time to give any relief to the spring planted crops. The planting of cotton and other crops is already well under way and our farmers cannot be expected to take the risk of losing an entire crop based solely on the hope that the soil bank will be forthcoming and provisions included which would give relief for the 1956 crop. I think that this measure should be given further consideration looking to the fall planted crops and crops for 1957.

Among the many needs for farm legislation at this session is the need for preventing further acreage reductions.

Cotton farmers have been forced to reduce their cotton acreage from 27 million acres in 1953 to an allotment of 21,379,358 acres in 1954, to 18,113,208 acres in 1955, to 17,391,304 in 1956. This represents a total reduction of 37 percent since 1953. Because of unusual weather conditions and other favorable factors our cotton farmers in 1955 made a bumper crop and did not feel the full impact of the almost 3.3 million acres reduction in 1955. This reduction, combined with the 700,000 reduction in 1956, will come with crushing effect upon our local economy. Even more serious is the scheduled reduction in acres for 1957, amounting to over 1,500,000 acres with possibly even greater reduction in 1958. Since 1953, our cotton acreage has been reduced by 10.5 million acres and brings us to a point where neither the farmer nor the cotton industry can absorb further reduction in acreage.

Cotton acreage in Mississippi has been reduced over 40 percent in the last 3 years and faces an additional reduction of 11.4 percent in 1957. Reductions in many of our counties and on individual farms have been even greater.

#### Reduction in acreage in Mississippi

Year	Planted acreage	
	Acreage	Percentage reduction
1953.....	2,671,000	
1954.....	1,960,000	26
1955.....	1,703,000	36
1956.....	1,600,000	40.1
1957.....	1,395,000	47.8

<sup>1</sup> Estimated, based on 2-year average underplanting.

If this situation is not corrected by the amendment to hold cotton acreage at the 1956 level, the farm program originally designed to assist the small- and medium-size farm will work to the disadvantage of the very people the program was originally designed to help.

I am also particularly interested in the small-farm provision which provides for 100,000 acres for 1957 and 100,000 acres for 1958 for assistance to the small farm of 4 cotton acres or less. I continue to receive reports that thousands

of our small farmers are being forced to abandon their farms and seek employment elsewhere. Of course, we recognize some shifts in farm population are desirable, but there is a question in my mind how fast we can make these shifts and maintain a proper balance. The reduced acreage allotment has seriously reduced the income of all farmers, but has inflicted a greater toll on the small farmer. The large farmers have been successful in making tremendous strides to increase efficiency, reduce costs, and increase yields which have enabled them to absorb some of the loss of acreage. However, the small farm units, because of inadequate credit and other limitations, have not made this rapid progress and are again placed in a most unfavorable situation.

The amendment designed to hold the cotton acreage allotment at the 1956 level for 1957 and 1958, and the amendment providing 100,000 additional acres over and above the national allotment for the farmer who has 4 cotton acres or less have been thoroughly justified and approved by the Senate. They were accepted by the conference committee and were a part of the farm bill vetoed by the President. These provisions are sound and desirable.

On behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. WOFFORD], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I reintroduce, for appropriate reference, the acreage bill today, and I urge the Senate Agriculture Committee to include these measures in an overall farm bill or act on them as a separate measure at the earliest possible date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3671) to prescribe minimum acreage allotments for cotton, introduced by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO ENCOURAGE SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS TO ENGAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend what is known as the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act, or section 921 of the 1942 General Revenue Act.

Mr. President, I will have much more to say about this bill when the Senate Finance Committee considers the bill, and I hope that such action by the committee can be scheduled in the near future.

At this time, I merely want to explain that all this bill will do is give the smaller manufacturers in the United States the same opportunities on the export markets of the Western Hemi-

sphere which have been enjoyed only by the largest of our manufacturing concerns.

This bill will put in legislative words the intent which was obvious in the Senate Finance Committee's report on the original amendment to the General Revenue Act.

That report said, in part, and I quote:

American companies trading in foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere are placed at a considerable competitive disadvantage with foreign corporations under the tax rates provided by the bill. To alleviate this competitive inequality, the committee bill relieves such corporations from surtax liability.

As I said previously, Mr. President, there is much more to be detailed about this bill in committee, and I am prepared, along with my cosponsor, to present sufficient material to the committee to convince the Members of this Senate that administration of this act in the past several years, due to the loose construction of the act, has denied the smaller manufacturer that equality of competition on the export market which the committee intended, while the largest manufacturers had that equality of competition.

There is admitted discrepancy of privilege and benefit as a result of administrative interpretations on this act, and I am certain in that the Senate never intended that the smaller manufacturer be burdened and the largest manufacturer be relieved in its effort to give United States businessmen equal opportunity with Foreign manufacturers on Western Hemisphere markets.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3672) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small business concerns to engage in foreign trade, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. FREAR), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 921 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (P. L. 591, 83d Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"§ 921. Definition of Western Hemisphere trade corporations.

"For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'Western Hemisphere trade corporation' means a domestic corporation all of whose business (other than incidental purchases) is done in any country or countries in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, and which satisfied the following conditions:

"(1) if 95 percent or more of the gross income of such domestic corporation for the 1-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for such part of such period during which the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources without the United States; the sources of gross income shall in general be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 862, provided, however, that for the purposes of this section, where personal property is manufactured within the United States and sold,

either by the manufacturer or by a wholly owned subsidiary of the manufacturer, for use or consumption in and actually shipped in due course to a Western Hemisphere country, the seller's income from such transactions shall be treated as derived entirely from sources other than sources within the United States; and

"(2) if 90 percent or more of its gross income for such period or such part thereof was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

For any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1954, the determination as to whether any corporation meets the requirements of section 109 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall be made as if this section had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1954."

#### HOLDING OF MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases. The Postmaster General has requested that this bill be introduced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3679) to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HOLDING MORE THAN ONE OFFICE UNDER THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. The bill does nothing but give to enlisted men what we gave last year to officers. Through oversight the enlisted men were left out.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3681) to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### COMMISSION TO STUDY ELECTIONS FINANCES AND RELATED ASPECTS OF ELECTIONS TO FEDERAL OFFICES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a joint resolution and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it, in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request

of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the Select Committee for Contribution Investigation filed its report on April 7 on the famous episode of the attempted \$2,500 natural gas bill contribution to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], it marked completion of the first stage of the Senate's program for action on the issue of money in politics, which that episode brought to the forefront of public attention. Another committee investigation and a modernized elections bill are two steps of that program now before the Senate. I wish to discuss today another proposal which I believe is urgently needed in order to assure really effective progress in this field—namely the creation of an independent citizens' commission on election finances, completely divorced from Government and politics.

I first made this suggestion in the Senate on March 9, about 6 weeks ago. Today, Mr. President, I submit it in the form of a joint resolution, which I now send to the desk, with the request that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to provide for the establishment of a Commission To Study Election Finances and Related Aspects of Elections to Federal Offices, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

*Resolved, etc.—*

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Congress finds that the manner in which the costs of election campaigns and other political processes are financed has important significance for democratic government.

In order for the Federal Government to function, under the Constitution, in response to the interests of the majority of the electorate, the choice among candidates for Federal elective office should not be obscured by the effects of disproportionate campaign expenditures. The rising cost of access to the most compelling media of public information increases this threat to an informed and considered choice by the electorate among such candidates.

Popular confidence in democratic government requires the assurance that the public actions of holders of or candidates for Federal elective office reflect only their own free judgment of the public interest, wholly unaffected by any need for concern about the financing of election campaigns.

#### ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established a Commission on Election Finances and Related Matters (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission").

(b) The Commission shall conduct a thorough, impartial, and continuing study and investigation of the following:

(1) The actual costs of modern campaigns for nomination and election to Federal elective offices (including any such campaigns



which may occur during the period of operations of the Commission);

(2) Current practices with respect to the financing of such campaign costs, of lobbying costs, and of other political activities;

(3) The relationship, if any, between the amount of campaign expenditures made in behalf of different candidates and their success at the polls;

(4) The relationship, if any, between sources of political financing, lobbying activities, and the public policies espoused and supported by holders of and candidates for Federal elective offices;

(5) Reforms which have been or may be proposed for the purpose of assuring the financing of the Nation's political processes by means consistent with the objectives of section 1 hereof.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of a Chairman and 14 members, to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

(b) The Chairman and members of the Commission shall be citizens of the United States (1) who, by reason of demonstrated interest in good government, or training, or experience, are well qualified to carry out in an impartial manner the duties of the Commission, and (2) who neither actively occupy nor are candidates for a public office or position and who are not actively engaged in partisan politics.

(c) The Commission shall establish rules for its procedure.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled by the Commission pursuant to rules adopted by the Commission for such purpose.

(e) The Chairman and members of the Commission shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

#### STAFF OF COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of the personnel it deems necessary for a thorough and comprehensive study, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

(3) The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

#### EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

#### POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee including not less than three members thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Sub-

ject to rules of the Commission adopted under section 3 hereof, subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the chairman of any subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of such subcommittee and may be served by any person designated by such chairman. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission may authorize the Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable. When the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(c) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

#### REPORTS

SEC. 8. The Commission may submit interim reports to the Congress at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1957, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

MR. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I shall explain why I believe the establishment of such an independent commission is needed if we are to get to the bottom of the real problems of election financing.

So far as information available to the public is concerned, the financing of our expensive biennial election campaigns may well be called the dark continent of American politics. The crude antics of Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff in connection with the natural gas bill on behalf of Mr. Keck, of the Superior Oil Co., have given the public a glimpse into one particular jungle; and now the public demands the kind of thorough exploration which is long overdue.

In this speech I have no intention of reciting the history of the \$2,500 episode. But the Senate and the country are indebted to the distinguished chairman [Mr. GEORGE] and the other members of the select committee for their investigation of that episode; and I want to cite some of the findings in their report which startlingly illustrate the kind of operations which so thoroughly obscure the true picture of political finance in our country.

#### TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLAR CASE SHOWS NEED FOR ANSWERS ABOUT CAMPAIGN FUNDS

First, the average citizen, who has made a personal sacrifice in the cause of democratic self-government when he gives \$5, or \$10, or even \$1, to the campaign of a candidate of his choice, is probably startled and, no doubt, discouraged at the sums involved. The select committee finds that Mr. Keck, the president of Superior Oil Co. of California,

turned over to one of the company's employees, Mr. Patman, for political purposes an average of \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year. The committee finds that "a sum approaching \$50,000 has been distributed in political contributions by Elmer Patman"; and that in 1955 he received either \$8,500 or \$9,500 from Mr. Keck. It is significant for those who have confidence in our reporting laws in this respect that, according to the committee report—

Keck was unable to establish the exact amount. It was testified that this discrepancy was caused by the fact that neither Patman nor Keck maintained any records, and Patman, under the arrangement, accounted to Keck orally when he happened to see him.

Who today can tell the public whether this is an isolated instance or whether it is typical of the manner in which money gets into politics? The channeling of sums of the magnitude of this oilman's \$50,000 into election campaign funds is of central significance for our political system. Yet, except for what the oil companies must regard as a deplorable accident, it would never have come to light.

Second, the committee's finding in this instance illustrate graphically the difficulty of knowing the source of funds such as those offered by Mr. Neff all over the West Central States. True, people might learn that Mr. Neff was interested in the natural gas bill. According to the committee—

Mr. Neff, in a space of 4 months, covered 5 States and sought out the attitude of 10 United States Senators concerning a single piece of legislation. A sum totaling \$10,000 was at least considered and spoken of by Mr. Neff as contributions, and \$5,000 of this was actually contributed.

But who, today, can tell the public with assurance on whose behalf men such as Mr. Neff offer their contributions? Where does the money for such large contributions really come from? The committee asks in its report:

Was the \$2,500 contribution to Senator CASE's campaign fund made by the Superior Oil Company of California?

And in reply, it can only report:

The testimony is that this money and in fact all of the \$7,500 which Mr. Patman gave to Mr. Neff in this situation was the personal money of Mr. Keck and was not that of Superior Oil. The committee, however, had no opportunity to audit the record of Superior Oil and is entirely dependent upon the statements made in the record concerning this point.

Third, perhaps it is relatively easy for Mr. Keck to obtain adequate compensation from the Superior Oil Co., so as to permit \$5,000 campaign contributions to be made, legally, by him, rather than illegally by the company. Equally significant, however, is the glimpse which this case study affords the public of the use of company personnel, on company time, for political purposes. The select committee reports:

The circumstances here have raised the question of whether there was a political contribution by a corporation, in a sense different from that discussed above. The select committee has considered this. The Superior Oil Company of California paid all of the salary and expenses of Mr. Patman and bargained for all of his time. This same

corporation paid Mr. Neff's fees and expenses. To the extent that Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff devoted their time to the dispensing of Mr. Keck's funds for political campaigns, was the Superior Oil Company of California making a political contribution? The select committee does not believe that this constituted a political contribution and was not proscribed by the law governing elections and political activities nor was in any other sense illegal.

The Superior Oil Company of California paid two employees to spend their time traveling around and dispensing the political largess of the president of the company. This may not be illegal. But, Mr. President, of more immediate importance is this question: Who would even know about it, under our present system, if it had not been for the deplorable accident of disclosure in this particular instance?

#### WHAT IS ROLE OF MONEY IN THE POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT TODAY?

In its summation, the select committee properly characterizes the methods which Mr. Keck chose to exercise his legal privilege of making political contributions as "a case of irresponsibility run riot." In the course of this riot of irresponsibility, Mr. Neff had tried to make to the children of the United States attorney for Nebraska money gifts, which that gentlemen returned. The committee reported that the United States attorney's conduct "is not reproachable and that he was merely a victim of an environment created by Mr. Neff."

Mr. President, this is a telling phrase. Beyond the question of lobbying, beyond any isolated instance of attempted corrupt influence on legislation, there is the pervasive question of the environment in which our political processes must operate. What does the increasing expense of every election, which must be financed from campaign contributions, do to that environment? How do the sky-rocketing election costs give money a role in the political environment which makes operations such as Mr. Neff's possible? These are the fundamental facts which the public is entitled to know, and which it demands to know. Who, today, can give the public these facts?

Mr. President, the truth is that, today, nobody knows how much money it costs to carry out one of our biennial national elections. These elections are the decisive events of our democratic system of self-government—the many local decisions, all over the country, by which we review and determine the direction of our national affairs and policies. Information and public debate of opposing points of view are the essence of such a system. But the expense of bringing this information and debate to the public is multiplying year by year. Today, there is a premium on access to the most expensive medium of them all—television. And no one today knows the facts about the effects of these unprecedented election costs, the need for raising campaign funds to meet them, and the accompanying inequalities between parties and candidates.

#### FACTS ABOUT ELECTION COSTS ARE NOWHERE AVAILABLE

Mr. President, I have tried hard to find some reliable data on campaign spending, and in my search I have found that other efforts have been made to collect such data. For example, on December 1, 1952, the New York Times published a State-by-State survey of expenditures in the 1952 election campaigns, so far as they could be determined from the records available to the Times' correspondents. The Times came up with the report that "at least \$32,155,251 had been spent by political organizations, independent groups and candidates," and that in at least a dozen States, campaign spending exceeded \$1 million. But the Times added:

This was a rock-bottom figure. \* \* \* The figure the survey shows is by no means the total that was spent. That total probably never will be ascertained.

Another example has been the efforts of the impartial Congressional Quarterly to report campaign expenditures after each national election. In its issue of April 15, 1955, the Congressional Quarterly stated \$13,700,000 as the ascertainable cost of electing the 84th Congress; but, like the New York Times, the Congressional Quarterly pointed out that this sum bore little relation to reality, and stated:

This, at least, is the sum of spending reported to Congress. \* \* \* As much or more spending, most observers agree, was not reported or reported only to State authorities.

Similarly, widely recognized political scientists, such as Prof. Louise Overacker, of Wellesley College and Prof. Hugh A. Bone, of the University of Washington—who served on the staff of the Senate committee investigating expenditures in the 1940 election—have for years studied campaign spending. Yet their findings, based on publicly available data, have necessarily been fragmentary; and reference to their reports does not give us any clearer picture of the actual totals of campaign spending than the one we obtain from the newspapers.

This universal lack of information on election finances is inevitable under our present system, and it reduces us to guesses which may be more or less informed. Thus, recent estimates I have seen that the 1956 elections will cost over \$100 million, cannot be described as extravagant. But when it takes sums of that magnitude every 2 or 4 years to conduct our democratic system, it is time to take a good look at what modern election costs are doing to our ideas of popular self-government, based on the principle of 1 person, 1 vote.

#### THOROUGH INVESTIGATION OF FACTS ESSENTIAL FIRST STEP TOWARD REFORM

Mr. President, I submit that the first step toward effective action to modernize our system of election financing must be a thorough exploration of the present system. Many valuable improvements in the corrupt practices laws are proposed in bills now before the Senate. I have introduced some additional proposals myself. But we cannot legislate intelligently in ignorance of the facts, and at the present time the facts about

election financing are no more available to Congress than they are to the public. That is why I make my proposal for an independent citizens' study commission, empowered to get the facts, as an essential first step toward reform.

A look at the joint resolution I have introduced will show that it makes a very simple proposal. The proposed Commission on Election Finances and Related Matters would be composed of 15 private citizens of demonstrated qualifications for the task. My joint resolution specifies that they shall be persons who "neither actively occupy nor are candidates for a public office or position and who are not actively engaged in partisan politics."

The Commission would be instructed to investigate the following:

First. The actual costs of modern campaigns for nomination and election to Federal elective offices, including any such campaigns which may occur during the period of operations of the Commission.

Second. Current practices with respect to the financing of such campaign costs, of lobbying costs, and of other political activities.

Third. The relationship, if any, between the amount of campaign expenditures made in behalf of different candidates and their success at the polls.

Fourth. The relationship, if any, between sources of political financing, lobbying activities, and the public policies espoused and supported by holders of and candidates for Federal elective office.

Fifth. Reforms which have been or may be proposed for the purpose of assuring the financing of the Nation's political processes.

The Commission would have authority and staff adequate to carry out such an investigation.

The only aspect of my proposal which may require a brief explanation is the method of selection of the members of the Commission. Under my resolution, the chairman and the initial membership of the Commission would be chosen by the Chief Justice of the United States.

#### SELECTION BY CHIEF JUSTICE WOULD ASSURE INSULATION FROM POLITICS

Mr. President, I am as concerned as anyone—perhaps more than some persons—to maintain the separation of our highest judicial tribunal from the ordinary processes of Government and politics. Accordingly, I hesitated for some time before proposing this method of selecting the Commission. But I consider it imperative that a commission to study the financing of our elections and related political processes be itself as far removed as possible from elections and politics. Not only must it not include persons who are present or prospective beneficiaries of campaign contributions, its members should not be the appointees of men in politics, who have such a personal stake in the matter of campaign contributions—from President Eisenhower on down. I sought in vain for some alternative method of selection; but, finally, I concluded that precisely because the Commission would be so removed from politics, it would not be inappropriate, in this exceptional case, to



have the appointments made by the Chief Justice.

The Chief Justice would act only once. He would select only the initial members and the chairman, who, I think, might be a distinguished retired jurist or a person of similarly self-evident impartiality and competence. After these initial selections, the Commission would itself have the power to fill any subsequent vacancies which might occur; it would adopt its own rules of procedure and, of course, select its own staff. Thus, I believe that my proposal would not be an undue imposition on the Chief Justice, while it would go further than any other method I can imagine toward assuring the public of the complete political independence of the Commission and its work.

I repeat, Mr. President, as I stated in the Senate on March 9, that insulation from the elective process is the sine qua non of an effective investigation of election spending, in which the public will have real confidence. The establishment of a citizens' commission was approved in an editorial in the New York Times of March 10, 1956; and on March 13, the Winston-Salem Journal editorially endorsed my recommendation. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement of March 9 and these editorials printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement and editorials may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

#### NO CONFLICT WITH SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to point out that the establishment of a Special Commission on Election Finances would in no way be inconsistent with the work of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. This is a committee of eight outstanding Members of the Senate, and I was particularly impressed with the statement of its distinguished chairman in undertaking the assignment. However, having been set up in direct response to the "\$2,500 episode" and other events surrounding the passage of the natural-gas bill, and to the President's allusions in vetoing that bill, this special committee of the Senate will of necessity be particularly concerned with lobbying and with the relationship of campaign contributions to legislation. In other words, it may be expected that the special committee will have a major task in studying, on the general plane, the same issues as were raised by the specific investigation and report of the \$2,500 incident by the select committee. The chairman of the special committee has already called for any evidence of wrongdoing. But lobbying and instances of wrongdoing and of possible corrupt practices as such would not necessarily be an important target of the independent citizens' commission. On the other hand, the Commission could undertake the essential task of making a detailed and continuing factual survey, State by

State, of the costs of election campaigns and the manner in which they are actually financed—a procedure which cannot be expected of a Senate committee. Thus, Mr. President, if there is any overlapping of functions, it would be slight.

Let me summarize the reasons why an independent Commission on Election Finances is necessary:

First. Increasing costs have made the role of money in elections a serious threat to our democratic processes.

Second. Nobody today knows or can find out how much is spent in election campaigns, how it is spent, where the money really comes from, and why it is contributed. The public is entitled to these facts.

Third. The Congress also needs to have these facts. We cannot know whether or not we are legislating intelligently in this field until this "dark continent" of American politics is explored and mapped.

Fourth. An independent commission could devote its full time and attention to this single, important problem until the job is done.

Fifth. A commission with this single assignment, if established now, could operate through the entire 1956 campaign and make a thorough, factual case study of this year's elections throughout the country, which are certain to be the most expensive in the history of our Nation.

Sixth. For obvious reasons, a really penetrating study of our present system of election spending and campaign contributions should be undertaken by persons whose selection and whose own personal interests are as thoroughly insulated from this system as possible. A commission composed and selected in the manner I propose would clearly have this study as its single, undivided objective. Its work would be assured of the public support and confidence which is essential to success in this vital undertaking.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I introduce my joint resolution and hope that it may win an early hearing in the Rules Committee and in the Senate.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1956]

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ever since the Senate decided to set up a special 8-man committee to inquire into the broad problems of lobbying, of campaign expenditures, and their relationship, I have had serious misgivings about my vote in favor of the resolution creating the committee. I say this without any reflection on any of the Members who were appointed to the special committee, because they are outstanding Senators. I would have had the same misgivings no matter which Senators might serve on such a committee.

Now, after listening to the thoughtful and even-tempered explanation by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] of developments which have occurred since the appointment of the special committee, and the cogent remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], I have concluded that I made a mistake when I voted for the resolution to turn over these crucial issues to a special committee of the Senate. A new

Member must learn by experience, and there was not much time for thorough reflection before the vote. I believe now that the Senate should not have bypassed its regular standing committees in dealing with the aspects of these problems which fall within their normal legislative functions and responsibilities.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the people of this country demand a thorough and impartial study of the whole matter of our methods of financing political campaigns and their relationship to lobbying—a matter which, because of recent events, is now getting the public attention it has long deserved. Already there have been heard suggestions that the Senate cannot investigate itself, any more than any other agency of government can investigate itself. In all candor, people wonder how Senators who were elected with substantial campaign funds raised by large, private contributions can inquire into other Senators' campaign exchequers. That question applies to all here, the junior Senator from Oregon included.

Speaking only for myself, Mr. President, I personally am ready to turn over to an outside commission, nonpartisan and broadly representative in character this entire problem for a thorough airing and for a study of constructive alternatives to our present approach to political finances. As I have had occasion to say before, in the Senate and elsewhere, this question of political campaign financing is rapidly becoming the central problem of our democratic processes, increasingly so every year as the cost of modern methods of campaigning skyrockets.

Such a commission, Mr. President, should include members from many walks of life—after all, every American is intimately affected by the actions and decisions of his representatives in Congress, whether he be a businessman or a workingman, a teacher, a farmer, a writer, or a scientist. It might include some eminent political scientists; and I suggest that it be headed by a retired jurist whose ability and nonpartisanship were beyond question.

I would turn over to such a commission, Mr. President, the function of finding out the facts about our present methods of political financing, and about the related aspects of lobbying. I would give such a commission the authority, the personnel, and the money to enable it to make the proper inquiry, and to stay with it during the present election year so as to accumulate a meaningful body of information about the problem. There are many precedents for the use of special commissions to make thorough studies of specific areas of public concern, and I believe a special commission, removed from the political arena, is needed to restore the confidence of the American people that they are, in fact, being told the full truth about their processes of government and politics.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would leave to the regular, standing committees of Congress the responsibility for acting now on pending legislative proposals for constructive and long-overdue steps to improve the situation with respect to campaign financing—steps which can and should be taken before the political campaigns of this presidential election year. These standing committees and the Congress can act constructively on legislative reforms without getting bogged down in controversy which will inevitably accompany efforts at senatorial investigation of this problem.

[From the New York Times of March 10, 1956]

#### GET ON WITH THE INQUIRY

When the special bipartisan Senate Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures and Lobbying Activities was set up 2 weeks ago, Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON observed that it "would go to the hard core

of our form of constitutional government—the confidence of the people in our institutions.”

Although Senator JOHNSON, as well as the Republicans, had, in our opinion, been far too slow in seeing the need for a full-scale inquiry, he did hit the nail on the head with this comment. The proposed investigation is necessary and important, particularly for the reason he gave, particularly because this is an election year.

What happened? An 8-man committee was appointed, consisting of 4 Democrats and 4 Republicans, and from that day to this they haven't been able to organize because neither side is willing to allow the other to be put in a position of control. The logical choice for chairman of the committee was Senator GORE, who had earlier pressed for a full-scale investigation. However, he would have become a chairman without a chair if the ranking Republican Senator BRIDGES, could have had his way. Apparently Mr. BRIDGES, a politician's politician if there ever was one, doesn't want to give the Democrats free rein in an election year to poke around in the dynamite-laden field of lobbies and campaign contributions. We wonder why the GOP is now reportedly willing to accept Senator McCLELLAN as chairman but not Senator GORE.

The idea of a bipartisan committee is theoretically sound for the task at hand, allowing neither party to gain undue advantage over the other in what could be a sensational investigation. But if bipartisanship in this area should prove beyond the capacity of human nature, there would be other ways in which the same end could be accomplished. Senator GORE (and others) originally proposed an inquiry by one of the standing subcommittees of the Senate. That would necessarily involve party control, but it would also involve party responsibility; and if the inquiry took an unfairly partisan direction it could lose its effectiveness and in fact would probably backfire on the majority.

Another and better method came yesterday from Senator NEUBERGER, who suggested establishment of a citizens' commission to look into the whole matter, headed perhaps by “a retired jurist of unquestioned non-partisanship and ability.” We think that is a good solution, certainly preferable to continuance of the present impasse or to agreement on a bipartisan inquiry so hamstrung as to be ineffective.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal of March 13, 1956]

#### ANOTHER SUPERFICIAL INQUIRY?

At long last the Senate's special committee to investigate lobbying and campaign contributions has picked a chairman and adopted rules. It is now quite apparent that the lawmakers who do not want a truly searching inquiry have won out.

The choice for chairman, Senator McCLELLAN, was reluctant to take on what he called a “most disagreeable and difficult task.” He made it plain that he is a compromise selection. The four Republican members of the committee simply would not accept Senator GORE without tying his hands with impossible restrictions.

The Senate did not want this investigation in the first place. It hoped to confine its job to looking into pressures surrounding the natural gas bill. But the special, four-man committee which undertook that limited investigation quickly found that the field was vast in scope: that it was very difficult to stick to its limited agenda.

To Senator BRIDGES and his three Republican colleagues, Senator GORE was a possibly dangerous man. They openly warned against “a runaway” committee. No such problem is posed by Senator McCLELLAN, the Arkansas Democrat who made a name for himself in the McCarthy-Army hearings.

He is a strong party man, a conservative fairly close to the GOP position.

As historians have noted, Congress has investigated lobbying seven times since 1854—and produced one law, in 1946. And the weaknesses of that law have produced the reasons for the current investigation.

Can we expect any real results this time around? It would take a real optimist to think so. First, it's election year. Secondly, the investigation will touch on sore spots perilously close to every Congressman—sore spots that could be exploited even though the lawmakers try to bend over backwards to resist monied influences. And finally, the fact that it took three weeks for the committee even to organize itself, after bitter backstage feuding between supposedly “bipartisan” members, is a sad augury of things to come.

Next time around we might give serious thought to Senator NEUBERGER's suggestion for a way out of the impasse. He has proposed creation of a special nonpartisan, citizens' commission to do the job—in view of “suggestions that the Senate cannot investigate itself” with complete candor.

Such a commission, he suggests, is needed to restore public confidence—to assure the people they are “being told the full truth about their process of government and politics.”

This idea has merit. It does not remove the desirability for the present committee to conduct a full investigation and propose sweeping changes in existing laws. But no one should be greatly surprised if the McClellan committee follows the path of its ineffectual predecessors.

#### CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3238) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

#### EXEMPTION FROM TAX IMPOSED FOR TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS OF AMOUNTS NOT EXCEEDING 60 CENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7634) to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the following amendments, namely:

Page 11 in lines 1 through 4 strike out the following: “and the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.” and insert “and for the Geological Survey or the General Services Administration to acquire a site and to prepare plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia, without regard to Revised Statutes, page 3709, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 302 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252 (c)).”

Page 15, line 16, after “\$15,250,000”, insert “, of which not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.”

Page 16, line 15, after “(69 Stat. 242)”, insert “: Provided, That all receipts from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.”

Page 39, line 25, after “(66 Stat. 781)”, insert “: Provided further, That the employment of not more than one person by contract or otherwise, pursuant to the third sentence of section 2 (c) of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended by the act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 783), may be extended for an additional year.”

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9390, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the year ending June 30, 1957, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

#### AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3602) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee, which I understand from the Parliamentarian, to be the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 11, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator



from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 236) directing the Tariff Commission to investigate whether imports of textiles or textile products are affecting injuriously the domestic industry, submitted by Mr. PAYNE (for himself and other Senators) on April 11, 1956.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Address entitled "Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?" delivered by him at the sixth annual conference on high energy nuclear physics, at Rochester, N. Y., on April 6, 1956.

Address entitled "Some Aspects of Law in the Atomic Age," delivered by him at the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association, at Hartford, Conn., on April 16, 1956.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him before Conference of Organizations on the United Nations, at Washington, D. C., on February 27, 1956.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator ANDERSON at the annual meeting of the Western Cotton Shippers Association, in El Paso, Tex., on April 12, 1956.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 23, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO TAXES ON INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 24, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 23, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. Such persons should contact the subcommittee counsel at the earliest possible date in order to arrange an appearance. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself. The chairman of the subcommittee has designated me to preside over these hearings.

#### CONFISCATION OF GERMAN PROPERTY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on February 1, in a speech on the Senate floor

dealing with confiscation of German property, I said I had written a letter to Mr. John J. McCloy, and that as soon as I received his reply I would put it in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the letter I received from Mr. McCloy, the letter written to Mr. Finucane by Mr. McCloy, and an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, dealing with the same subject.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 27, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have just had an opportunity to read your letter to me dated February 13. The letter came after I had left for a somewhat extended tour of the Middle East, from which I have very recently returned. I have also read with interest your references to me contained in the speech that you made to the Senate on February 1, which references are contained on page 1795 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you were good enough to send to me.

Unfortunately, I do not have ready access to many of the records which were made at the time of the meeting to which you refer. My personal records are scattered about and so I would have to reply to you at the present time purely from memory. My recollection of the meeting in Mr. Hull's office to which you refer is, however, very vivid. I also recall very well the paper which was initiated by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill and the manner in which it was presented to the group by Mr. Morgenthau.

This paper set out the general principles under which Germany was to be administered after the expected victory was accomplished. There had been considerable discussion regarding the principles of our policy respecting defeated Germany. The discussions took place in the War Department, the State Department and, to some extent, in the Treasury Department. If my recollection serves me right, the War Department was the first one to initiate any draft directives on this subject as it was presumably their responsibility to administer defeated Germany. However, the State Department proceeded to draw up some principles under which Germany was to be governed and the Treasury Department did likewise. Both of these proposals shocked Mr. Stimson, the proposal of Mr. Hull only a little less than that of Mr. Morgenthau. For Mr. Stimson's reaction to the Hull and the Morgenthau proposals and my part in it all I would refer you to Mr. Stimson's book entitled "On Active Service in Peace and War." If you will refer to page 568 of this book you will there find a discussion of the so-called Morgenthau plan. It is an entirely accurate account so far as I can now recall.

Mr. Morgenthau had apparently pressed upon Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill at Quebec an endorsement of his views as to how conquered Germany should be administered. On his return to Washington he brought with him the initialed memorandum which you referred to in your speech. He laid it before Mr. Hull and Mr. Stimson in the former's office in the State Department. I was present in Mr. Hull's office when the document was presented. I have no record to confirm it but I believe I recall that Mr. White was also present at this meeting. I say this because Mr. White was usually present at meetings which Mr. Morgenthau attended dealing with the administration of Germany. The initialed agreement between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill is set forth in full at the bottom of page 576 and the top of page 577 of Mr.

Stimson's book. I saw the original and it conformed to the copy in the Stimson book.

I took part in the drafting of all the memorandums which Mr. Stimson submitted to his colleagues in protest to the so-called Morgenthau plan, as well as to the original Hull plan.

As you will see from the initialed agreement as it is set forth on pages 576-7 of Mr. Stimson's book, there is no reference made to the confiscation of German assets throughout the world. Though I think the original initialed memorandum has disappeared, there is no doubt that the reproduction of it in Mr. Stimson's book is complete and accurate. I believe that a number of photostatic copies still remain in existence.

I believe the foregoing gives you the essential data that you are seeking in regard to the initialed agreement and to Mr. Stimson's and my connection with it. The record, I think, is quite clear that Mr. Stimson and I, from the beginning, were in strong disagreement with the so-called Morgenthau plan, particularly as it was reflected in the agreement between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill which was initialed in Quebec; but it contained no reference to German assets throughout the world. If there is any further information that you seek and I am in a position to supply it, I shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCCLOY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 27, 1956.

MR. JAMES FINUCANE,

Executive Secretary, Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FINUCANE: I have your letters of February 6 and 24 in regard to the statements made by Senator LANGER on the floor of the Senate in regard to the initialed agreement of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill respecting the policies to be applied to Germany in the postwar period. I received a letter from Senator LANGER asking me to state what I know of this memorandum and I have replied in the form attached.

As you will see from my reply to Senator LANGER, the initialed document which was presented to the meeting in Mr. Hull's office was as set out in Mr. Stimson's book. I think Mr. Morgenthau had the original copy with him and displayed it to us. He also had some photostatic copies. The agreement, as he presented it to us, had nothing to say about the confiscation of German assets throughout the world, nor did I ever hear it suggested that Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill advocated such a policy. Subsequently, I heard that some attempt was made to find the original initialed copy but it could not be located. I always had a feeling that someone in the White House—not Mr. Roosevelt—had destroyed it after all the criticism of the policy had appeared in the newspapers. I am certain the original was initialed in the handwriting of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, both of whose handwriting I was familiar with. There were also several photostatic copies about. The text of the initialed statement was just as it appeared in Mr. Stimson's book—no more, no less.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCCLOY.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

LANGER SEEKS FACTS BEHIND HARSH POLICY—AGREEMENT DRAWN AT QUEBEC

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—The original Quebec memorandum, initialed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, of Britain, which defined postwar policy toward Germany, has disappeared.

The disappearance of the document was reported today in letters to Senator Langer, Republican, of North Dakota, and James Finucane, executive secretary of the Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, from John J. McCloy, former assistant war secretary and former High Commissioner to Germany. The Quebec Conference was held in September 1944.

McCloy had demanded the original initialed document to determine whether the harsh peace policy against Germany had originated at the Churchill-Roosevelt level. The strong peace policy against postwar Germany has been attributed in large measure to the late Harry Dexter White, Treasury aid, who died mysteriously while his Communist associations were under investigation.

#### FBI WARNINGS IGNORED

The Federal Bureau of Investigation had warned the White House on White's Communist associations. Former President Truman ignored the warnings and named him United States executive director of the International Monetary Fund. White is credited with having given American occupation money printing plates to Russia. Use of the plates by the Russians to turn out money in occupied Germany cost American taxpayers an estimated \$250 million.

McCloy denied that the original document contained any reference to confiscation of German property throughout the world. He intimated that the document was destroyed in the White House by persons apparently anxious to hide the fact that Roosevelt had not called for confiscation and other harsh measures imposed on Germany.

LANGER interpreted McCloy's letter as fixing responsibility for confiscation of German property at Federal echelons lower than Roosevelt or his successor, Harry S. Truman. McCloy said he was certain that White was aware of the exact language of the Quebec memorandum, which embraced only part of the Morgenthau harsh peace plan.

#### SUSPECTED DESTRUCTION

"I heard that some attempt was made to find the original initialed copy, but it could not be located," McCloy wrote the committee on return of confiscated property. "I always had a feeling that someone in the White House, not Mr. Roosevelt, had destroyed it after all the criticisms of the policy [the Morgenthau plan] had appeared in the newspapers."

Proponents and defenders of the confiscation policy insisted that it originated with Roosevelt and Churchill. Critics of the policy insisted that the policy originated at middle- or upper-level bureaucracy without Presidential knowledge or approval. In a speech read to the Senate last February 1, Langer demanded that the original document be produced to settle the clouded question.

"The [Quebec] agreement as he [Treasury Secretary Morgenthau] presented it to us had nothing to say about the confiscation of German assets throughout the world, nor did I ever hear it suggested that Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill advocated such a policy," McCloy wrote the committee.

#### SAYS HE RECALLS MEMO

In his letter to Langer, McCloy reiterated his insistence the original document, which he said he recalled very well, included the initials of Roosevelt and Churchill.

"The paper set out the general principles under which Germany was to be administered after the expected victory was accomplished. There had been considerable discussion regarding the principles of our policy respecting defeated Germany.

"The discussions took place in the War Department, the State Department and, to some extent, in the Treasury Department. If my recollection serves me right, the War Department was the first one to initiate any

draft directives on the subject as it was presumably their responsibility to administer defeated Germany.

#### "WHITE USUALLY PRESENT

"However, the State Department proceeded to draw up some principles under which Germany was to be governed and the Treasury Department did likewise. Both of these principles shocked Mr. Stimson (War Secretary Henry Stimson), the proposal of Mr. Hull (State Secretary Cordell Hull) only a little less than that of Mr. Morgenthau."

McCloy recalled that Roosevelt brought the original Quebec document to Washington and laid it before Hull and Stimson. McCloy said:

"I have no record to confirm it, but I believe I recall Mr. White was also present at this meeting. I say this because Mr. White was usually present at meetings which Mr. Morgenthau attended dealing with the administration in Germany."

McCloy said he and Stimson were in strong disagreement with the Morgenthau plan particularly as it was reflected in the Quebec agreement. But he insisted the agreement did not authorize confiscation of German property.

#### COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION— ADDRESS BY W. P. KENNEDY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago, on March 28, at Bismarck, N. Dak., a very interesting address dealing with the subject of collective political action, was delivered by W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION

Mr. Chairman and friends, North Dakota holds a warm and enchanted place in my heart. It was on the Dakota division of the Great Northern Railroad where I obtained my first job as a railroad brakeman in 1909. I worked in and out of Grand Forks to Fargo, Devil's Lake, and Neche.

It was in North Dakota where I joined the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and began the career in the collective efforts with my fellow trainmen. I shall always remember that beginning which started me in brotherhood activities more than 46 years ago.

I served as a brakeman on the Oriental Limited, that famous passenger train, the first trip the locomotive was equipped with an electric headlight.

That brilliant, shining electric beam seemed to have lighted a new pathway across the State, for it was not long after its first rays pierced the darkness of the Dakota nights until farmers began their first successful venture into the political limelight of the Nation and of the world.

You may be sure that it was a pleasure for me to accept the invitation to be with you on this momentous occasion. Happy as I am to be here today there is the full realization of the grave importance of your convention—especially the convention of this year, a most important political year—for the people of North Dakota and for the Nation, and it could also be very important for the people of the world.

#### FARMERS DISCONTENT

While this is my first visit to a convention of the league, it is not my first knowledge of the great good you have accomplished throughout the years in keeping the cooperative endeavors alive and active for the

advancement of the people economically, socially, and politically.

As a brakeman years ago switching grain cars to and from the elevators along the Great Northern tracks, I often heard the grumbling discontent of the farmers, as they vainly tried to get justice in the grading and docking of the wheat, barley, flax, and oats they were selling to the big grain companies of that day. There never seemed to be any first grade grain grown in North Dakota—the high grades of the grain did not seem to develop until they reached the markets of the Twin Cities, Chicago, and the East.

I also learned of the excessive gouging of the big insurance companies on the rates and settlements on hail and crop insurances. Then, too, there were the banks with the high interest rate, often coupled with added premiums to make borrowing of money all the more difficult for the struggling farmers.

#### COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION

It was most encouraging to note that the aroused and embittered farmers met the challenges of unfair grading and docking of grain with the resultant low prices, the unreasonable insurance charges and the excessive interest rates, by organizing, building, and fighting for the Non-Partisan League.

In the League those fighting stalwart pioneers develop facility for independent political action. It was a bitter struggle in the slow and difficult climb to the success of obtaining a majority in the legislature and placing friends in other public offices.

Those early organizers in the League virtually faced the furies of hell in their efforts to reach the farmers out on the prairies. The leaders of the political party in control at the time fought like demons against any encroachment on their political domain—the newspapers, the banks, the insurance companies, the railroads, and the grain brokers were all aligned together as a solid phalanx against those determined farmers.

Although activity in the Brotherhood work took me away from my original employment on the railroad in North Dakota, I have always kept in close contact with the work here. With great interest I have watched the League grow in importance and influence. Some of my close contacts have been Elric and Agnes Geelan, of Enderlin, along with Arthur Ford and Bill Dolan, of Bismarck, our vice president. These fine people have been helpful in keeping me supplied with details of your good work throughout the years.

#### LABOR SUPPORTS THE LEAGUE

The league officers and members have always had the support of the workers in labor unions in the cities and on the railroads of North Dakota. For the first time in the State it was clearly demonstrated that the industrial and political enemies of the farmers were also the enemies of the union workers. Strange as it may seem to be, that situation has not changed materially during the intervening years. Our enemies are still the enemies of the farmers, who want and are willing to fight for justice.

Some of the farmers who battled for justice 40 years ago still recount the difficulties faced in attempting to get redress for their grievances from the politicians in control of the State government. I can imagine that there are many of you here today who have had similar difficulties with the more modern type of controlled politician elected when the farmers failed to vote collectively for the interests of the people.

#### POLITICAL PRAIRIE FIRE

Recently I read the book "Political Prairie Fire" by Robert Morlan and "Farmers Political Action in North Dakota" by Congressman USHER L. BURDICK. They were good and interesting reading. They served as sort of



detailed refreshers of many things I had general knowledge of at the time of the occurrences. It might be a good thing, if all persons interested in preserving our freedoms and our economic, social, and political gains, would review the events of those trying days, when league organizers were denied the use of public meeting places, and were even run out of the counties, were tarred and feathered, and were jailed, often held without bond. They were not only mistreated, beaten and slandered, but were often denied the constitutional guarantees. Yes, that all took place in America—in North Dakota and in Minnesota—on many occasions. The big business interests and their political stooges did not like the idea of farmers organizing. It was abhorrent to think of farmers taking collective political action, or making any other collective efforts in their own behalf. In recalling the eventful days of the early organization of the league I shall always remember and revere the names of George S. Loftus, Arthur C. Townley, Lynn J. Frazier, Edwin F. Ladd, and Magnus Johnson for the part they took in that great move for political freedom.

Oh, yes, there are many thousands of others who stood faithfully and solidly with those sturdy leaders as they bore the brunt of the fierce onslaughts. Each and every one who stood loyally with the collective effort deserves high praise for their noble deeds.

The battle they fought is not over—it never will be over. They began the collective effort to work and fight together for the common good of the people. That was a battle for security, for social equality and for political freedom. You and I must carry it along and do our part—our children and their children must do likewise, if we are to keep this State, this Nation and the world as places where human beings can live and prosper as God intended it to be.

The history of the Nonpartisan League shows conclusively that it has earned its right to existence, for the great good accomplished throughout the many years. It has been and is today of great economic value to the people of North Dakota—I mean all of the people—the workers in industry, in the shops, mills, mines, factories, stores, on the railroads, and the housekeepers, as well as the farmers out on the prairies.

#### NAME CALLING

The league provides common grounds on which we can all meet to discuss our economic and political problems in the interests of the majority of the people.

When we meet and act collectively to solve our mutual problems we may expect to be called all sorts of names by those whose self-interests are in conflict with the public good.

It can be recalled that in the early days the political stooges called the organizers of the league Socialists and termed the league's objectives as being socialistic. That name-calling did not stop those who dared to fight for the right—it seemed to spur them on to greater and more determined efforts.

Name-calling must not stop you in 1956 or in any future campaign. Always remember that for centuries past the stooges of the oppressors have name-called with what seemed to be the most unpopular, vile and scare names at the time. It is almost unbelievable but some persons are still using the scare names of socialists, socialistic and socialism in an attempt to frighten people away from ideals, issues and actions that are to the best interests of all.

The present national administration in Washington is no exception in its efforts to destroy the public gains made in flood control, conservation, recreation, irrigation and public power. In the Northwest we have good examples of what length the administration will go to in order to serve their friendly interests—who always seem to be those who made large and impressive cam-

paign contributions. First and most outstanding in the Northwest is the Hells Canyon project for public power, flood control, conservation, irrigation and recreation, and, second, is the persistent efforts to give away the public natural resources in the grazing land, timber, minerals and oil, much of which has already been allotted in national parks and national preserves. And there's that Dixon-Yates smelly deal in an attempt to throttle the greatest and most successful public development, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I thought they reached a new low in name-calling not so long ago when the President was asked what he thought of the Tennessee Valley Authority. According to press reports he termed that great beneficial achievement as "Creeping socialism."

#### TVA BRINGS NEW LIFE

The TVA has created a new order of fruitful life in the Tennessee River Valley which stands out as one of the great public accomplishments of modern civilization. Its abundant resources have made formerly barren and flooded areas prosper alike. Thousands upon thousands of farm and workers' homes have electric light and power that would not have had them without that great public improvement.

None of the private corporations offered to finance such developments on a scale large enough to serve multiple purposes of flood control, power conservation, and recreation. It remained a job for the people through the Federal Government. The Federal expenditures for TVA are being repaid ahead of schedule. The powerful utility corporations in that territory opposed and are still fighting TVA despite the fact that TVA has brought them more prosperous times than they ever knew before.

I say to you, TVA is not socialism, creeping, crawling or any other kind. It is just plain good common sense for the people to do for themselves that which cannot be done so well by others. There must be more public developments similar to TVA in all places where there is need of flood control, power and irrigation. The progress made in the Columbia River Valley must be continued. The Hells Canyon project should be revived and completed as a public project in the interests of the people. The Missouri and other river basins should be developed where disastrous floods will be unknown.

#### FLOODS CAN BE PREVENTED

The disastrous floods such as that which did so much damage in Yuba City, Calif., and other places can be prevented, if the national administration will quit its little dam foolishness and start building large multiple purpose dams, to serve and to save the people from flood disasters and power shortages. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I was referring to the good accomplished by TVA and not IVA.

I am sure the record will show conclusively that the farmers, the business people in farm communities and the workers have benefited alike in the statewide program adopted as a result of the activities of the non-partisan league. The State hail insurance, the State bank of North Dakota, the State mill and elevator, the State workmen's compensation bureau, and the State guarantee of bank deposits were all pioneering efforts in an attempt to serve the people in methods and ways in which the corporations had failed miserably. Many of those primary efforts have been adopted nationally and are now important assurances in our economy.

If the people of the United States were given an opportunity to express themselves on the matter of guarantee of bank deposits, the vote would be overwhelmingly in the affirmative—yet, it has not been so very long ago that great improvement in stabilizing our banks was termed socialistic. The

same thing was true in the State's establishment of grain grades and requirements of testing grains. So, I repeat, we must be prepared now and in the future, against any and all sorts of name calling; this election year will be no exception, and especially so should you decide to support candidates other than those sponsored by the political stooges of the powerful corporations.

The farm organizations have made great progress in their cooperative efforts since the formation of the nonpartisan league. The Farmers Union deserves great credit for its farsightedness in taking over the equity cooperative exchange when the big corporations were beating it down. Through the unceasing labors of M. W. Thatcher that splendid effort was saved in the organization of the successful Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul with its far flung operations in the northwest.

The Farmers Union, the Grange, and the Farm Bureau all have important parts in keeping alive and building the spirit of cooperation among the agricultural producers of our time.

#### DECLINING FARM PRICES

I know you are greatly concerned over the decline in farm income during the past few years. It should be the concern of all who believe in a continued prosperous America. The records of the Department of Agriculture in Washington show that the realized net income of farm operators in North Dakota declined from \$222.5 million in 1951 to \$134.6 million in 1954, a 39-percent decline. This decline is largely due to the fall in cash receipts in farm marketings, which were \$563.8 million in 1951 and only \$465.2 million in 1954 in the State.

The decline in farm income is a very real problem affecting farmers in all States. In 1951 the Nation's farmers realized net income of \$14.8 billion. The Department of Agriculture has just reported the realized net income for 1955 was only \$10.8 billion. A billion-dollar loss for each of the 4 years.

A recent Department of Agriculture statement says that farmers retained as net income in 1955 only 32½ percent of their realized gross income, and further states that except for 1932, that was the smallest percentage on record. The few figures just quoted are sufficient to show the danger signals in the economic pathway ahead.

What is being done to avert disaster? Not very much—nothing substantial—except in this, an important political campaign year, they are getting a little worried about the attitude of the farmers. Farmers have votes in election years—something had to be done quickly and effectively—change the parity payments in line with the previous campaign promises? No, that is out of date. The immediate remedy was to follow the pattern set by the State Department, employ a prominent public-relations firm, build a perfectly bright shining halo of favorable publicity around the Secretary of Agriculture; let the farmers and all others see the Secretary in the light of a saviour of the farmers' economic ills. The second phase of the publicity consists of trying to lay the blame for depressed farm prices on others.

#### BENSON WRONG AGAIN

It appears to be a plan on Secretary Benson's part to make farmers believe that increases in prices of materials and equipment they buy is hurting them more than decline in the price of farm products they sell. Its purpose is to antagonize the farmer against the worker, thereby to divert the farmer's attention from the declining prices of farm products.

It is not my intention today to pass final judgment on the extent the administration has fulfilled or failed to fulfill its pre-election promises. Ordinarily an officer of a labor union stays within his own field and does not make speeches on agricultural problems.

My remarks here today are not intended as an exception to that rule. However, I do believe it quite appropriate to state the facts with regard to the unfair and unjustified insinuations of Secretary Benson, in his attempt to lay blame on the workers for his failure to act promptly, wisely, and prudently in the matter of declining farm produce prices. As an American and an officer of a labor organization, I believe it is out of place for any Government official to attempt to create discord between farmers and industrial workers on no more basis than Secretary Benson has shown to date. I must point out to you that the logic of the Secretary's position is that wage increases are wrong, that the farmer is in a worsening position because of past wage increases, and the only way the farmer can be helped is by recalling wage increases and instituting a great program of wage and consumer commodity price reductions. The chief purpose of such a program appears to be that of focusing everyone's attention on the wage policies of labor unions as the primary factor in the farmer's declining income situation. The attempt of Secretary Benson to drive a wedge between the farmers and organized labor is not a new thing. We have had recurring attempts to plant seeds of distrust and antagonism between the farmers and the industrial workers.

#### REAL ISSUE IS FARM PRICES

It can be recalled that in a similar condition existing in the 1920's, farm produce prices were down; workers wages were used as the scapegoat of that time. A great crusade of wage cutting developed. Unemployed and low-wage workers were not good customers for farm produce. The produce prices fell lower and lower, and farm mortgage foreclosures increased so fast that the situation became a national disgrace. The situation became so tense in some States that the county sheriffs didn't dare to make any further farm mortgage foreclosure sales. Does the Secretary of Agriculture hope to bring back a similar situation as a result of his great campaign of publicity—to blame workers' wages for the low farm produce prices?

Although I have no intention of recommending any definite farm policy, I am convinced that far more constructive things can be done than trying to make organized labor the scapegoat in this serious situation. The lesson revealed by statistics is clear; there was only a slight increase in the expenses of producing farm income between 1951 and 1955; while there was more than \$4 billion decrease in the gross income received by farmers from the sale of farm products. Really, I believe it to be more sensible to bolster the prices received by the farmers than to place blame on the farmers' expenses which in 1955 were practically at the same level as in 1951.

#### INTERDEPENDENCE OF FARMERS-WORKERS

Secretary Benson and his cohorts in the Administration, appear to overlook or disregard the interdependence between farmers and industrial workers. There was nothing more characteristic of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt than his oft-repeated insistence in and out of Presidential campaigns, in messages to the Congress, in his writings and in informal conversations on the basic interdependence between agriculture and industry; between farmers and industrial workers.

I have always considered that the late President and his administrations constituted a valuable educational force that advanced real understanding by the farmers of the urban industrial worker and the industrial worker of the farmer. It was during his administration that price-support programs for agricultural products were first adopted, and farming was taken out of those risky year-by-year ventures without

any assurances whatsoever. It was also in that era the industrial workers were encouraged to organize in unions with objectives, among others, of increasing income of both industrial workers, and because of their increased purchasing power, the income of the farmers.

We are all well aware of the favorable results. It did not hurt the economy of the Nation for the farmer and the industrial worker to be prosperous. That more than anything else has guided our Nation into our greatest overall economic prosperity. Shall we follow the pattern of the twenties—take the solution offered by Secretary Benson, reduce the wages of industrial workers in a vain and foolish effort to help farmers out of the present difficulties—or shall we progressively move forward to solutions that will work and will restore farm incomes? The first essentials are those of maintaining purchasing power of those who need and use the farm products and keep farm produce prices at parities necessary to maintain prosperous conditions, on the farms of America, and that includes the farms of North Dakota.

I have interestingly watched Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Congressman USHER BURDICK in their efforts in the Congress to obtain fair and reasonable consideration of the farm produce price conditions. May I take this occasion to point out that the labor unions have supported legislation desired by agricultural interests for the direct benefit of the farmers. In recent years we have found some of the farmer organizations lined up with the enemies of labor unions in supporting legislation which would destroy some of the long-established activities of the unions in their pursuits to adequately serve the workers in industry.

#### MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING NECESSARY

We need a return to the mutual understanding that existed in the time of the late President Roosevelt. We must have a positive program to restore the health of agriculture. The downward spiral of farm income must be stopped. We know from our experiences in the twenties that we need not act out of consideration for the farmers alone, because our welfare, and the welfare of the Nation, are inseparably tied to the welfare of the farmers. Historically we know that depressed agriculture brings depression in the entire community. We can see the sickening emphasis on the farmers worsening position in the latest figures on per capita income as between agricultural and nonagricultural.

We are sorry that the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to see or to heed the danger signals. Now on the eve of an important national election they come forward with some effort. Are we again to witness "too little, too late"?

#### CONSUMER COSTS AND FARM PRICES

Senator LANGER made a good move when he tried to secure an investigation of the price spread between what the farmer gets for food products and what the consumer has to pay. The administration has never given a satisfactory answer for its opposition to such an investigation. You on the farms and we of the urban centers should know what such an investigation would reveal.

The whole sum and substance of what to do and how to do it best, hinges largely, if not entirely, upon why you are meeting in this convention of the nonpartisan league. It is now as it was 40 years ago when George Loftus, Arthur Townley and their associates discovered that the only redress possible for justice was in collective political action by the citizens in the rural and urban communities. This is 1956, 40 years after their discovery, and their bold, but determined efforts to take political action collectively, for the common good of all. The old-guard

politicians will not like what you do in this convention for the good of the people of North Dakota; they didn't like it 40 years ago. There will be combinations, and alignments of the old guard with their newest additions in their efforts to keep control of the State government and of the destinies of the people. We cannot falter or fall now in our collective political efforts. We must go forward. A step backward could mean terrific losses, hard to regain.

This is 1956, a year of political destiny. You can make it one—for the people of this great State. May God grant you the wisdom to do so.

#### EIGHTY-FIVE AMERICAN YEARS— BOOK WRITTEN BY HENRY CARL LUCKEY, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Mr. Henry Carl Luckey served Nebraska as a Representative in Congress in the 74th and 75th Congresses. Although Mr. Luckey was born in 1868, he still possesses remarkable vigor and insight and capabilities.

Former Representative Luckey has recently published a book entitled "Eighty-Five American Years." This book is filled with history of interest not only to Nebraskans but to all Americans. There is running through Mr. Luckey's book a profound belief in and devotion to the American traditional system. Some very interesting political matters are related. I am sure that many will find, as I found, that Mr. Luckey's book is worthwhile reading.

#### THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND EVENING EXPRESS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Saturday the Portland Evening Express, of Portland, Maine, printed an editorial setting forth the merits of the soil-bank program. The editorial particularly referred to the contribution a soil-bank program would make to the conservation of wildlife, timber, and water resources. Quoting from the National Wildlife Federation, the editorial states:

The stage can be set for a well-rounded program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation with benefits that would accrue to the general public as well as to the farmer under the soil-bank plan.

Because all of us are in general agreement as to the worth of such a soil-bank program, it is my hope that we can still enact within the very near future a soil-bank program which will prove to be of substantial benefit to the agricultural community and to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial entitled "The Soil Bank," which I have cited above, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the merits of the soil-bank proposal made by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson has received scant attention in the debates, such as they were, and in the press. It has generally been the thought that taking land out of cultivation would



decrease production, as it would; but there is something else that is good in the plan.

The National Wildlife Federation declares that the soil-bank program could become the greatest boon to farm game restoration ever devised by the Government. Previous Federal payments to farmers for conservation practices have been rather narrowly restricted to erosion control and soil management phases. In some instances, wildlife, timber, and water resources have been neglected or even abused under subsidization by the Federal Government with agricultural conservation payments. Under the new proposal, says the Federation, "the stage can be set for a well-rounded program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation with benefits that would accrue to the general public as well as to the farmer under the soil-bank plan."

That seems to make sense. There might come many areas that eventually would become forested, and many of them might provide the windbreaks that could promote not only more beauty and comfort for the farm family, but might even lessen the danger of dust storms. It ought to be recalled that President Roosevelt early in his administration suggested a vast tree-planting program out on the flat plains, a program to be paid for out of Federal funds which in those days were by some considered inexhaustible. His proposal was treated with derision, but it had no trifling amount of commonsense behind it. Though in a smaller way, the soil-bank plan could prove a boon in almost every way to the farmer, and even while it defends against the piling up of additional surpluses.

The New York Times, Friday, quoted sources close to the White House as predicting that President Eisenhower will veto the farm bill which the Congress, playing politics in an election year, crammed through, and will go directly to the people via radio and television next Thursday to explain why he had to veto the bill.

If those sources are correct, the soil-bank section of the measure will suffer veto as well as the features that the President and Secretary Benson deplore, for it is impossible to pick and choose out of an entire act of Congress. That is inescapable. That being so, the National Wildlife Federation and the general public can but feel aggrieved at a Congress which has yielded to politics what it owed to the Nation.

#### CONDITION OF THE BUDGET

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release I have prepared about the condition of the budget be printed in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART today called to the attention of the Senate figures bearing out his prediction that the administration probably will balance the budget and show a surplus for this fiscal year.

The Senator based his remarks on information contained in a memorandum released today by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—a memorandum prepared by the committee staff from information contained in the publication *Economic Indicators* for April.

Senator CAPEHART quoted the following two paragraphs from the memorandum:

"1. Reports through mid-April indicate that the Federal budget will show an administrative surplus of about \$2 billion and a cash surplus of perhaps \$4 billion for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. These committee staff estimates represent increases in receipts of about \$3 billion over estimates

in the January budget, which were reaffirmed in February by the Secretary of the Treasury. Expenditures may be about \$1 billion higher (due mainly to handling CCC payments inside the budget rather than by sale of notes to commercial banks).

"2. For the fiscal year 1957, the surplus will probably be larger than estimated in the January budget unless: (a) business conditions deteriorate, or (b) legislation increases expenditures significantly more than estimated."

"These figures bear out what I have been anticipating and predicting for some time," Senator CAPEHART said. "This, of course, is a healthy sign and reflects the institution of improved administrative procedures which have made possible a balanced budget and a surplus in our Government finances for the first time in many years."

"I congratulate those responsible and express the sincere hope that the picture in 1957 and in the years ahead will be even brighter," Senator CAPEHART said.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### THE NEGRO'S DECLARATION OF INTENTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Rev. J. W. Hayes, president of the Missionary

Baptist State Convention of Kansas, and pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, of Wichita, Kans., forwarded to me an article written on April 3, 1956, by Rev. Dr. J. H. Jackson, president of the National Baptist Convention, and pastor of the Olivet Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill. The article is entitled "The Negro's Declaration of Intention."

Dr. Jackson prepared this article after conferring with Negro citizens from all walks of life in all parts of the country. After getting the views of these people, together with his own impressions, he wrote this statement.

Inasmuch as Dr. Jackson is one of the outstanding leaders of the Negro race, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### DECLARATION

1. At all times, we intend to support the Federal Constitution, to obey the laws of the land, to avoid contempt of courts, and to respect the judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and to always abide by the same.

2. Whatever is said or done against the United States of America by enemies, foreign or domestic; we will ever oppose with all of our heart, mind, body, soul, and strength.

3. We intend to continue to teach our children that this Nation is a great free republic of law and order, with a system of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And any person who disobeys the laws of the land and teaches others to do so, is a declared enemy of this Nation, and is working for its overthrow; and hence, does not deserve the right of free participation in the Nation's life, and is unworthy of the security that the country gives, and is subject to the penalties of the law. We shall also teach our children that this Nation under God, was founded in the spirit of justice, freedom, and due regard for moral law, and cannot survive without remaining true to its foundation principles.

4. We intend to participate in the total cultural life of the Nation, both for personal growth and development, and for the further progress of the country itself.

5. We intend always, to cherish and to give thanks for those natural endowments and special gifts that have made our race great; and pledge all of our talents and resources in the building of a better social order and a more democratic world.

6. In spite of the doctrine of the segregationist, we shall always believe that the basic quality of real distinction is character, not color; and the stature of a person is determined by the power of his mind, the purity of his heart, and the highest possible dedication of his life.

7. We intend to crusade against all the evils in our society that are designed to poison creative human relationships, and to crush the constructive growth of human personality, and to fight against the false doctrine which claims that some men are by origin, birth, and nature, superior to others.

8. While we shall recognize a need for the patience that accompanies growth, we intend at all times to reject that doctrine of gradualism which implies that the established laws of the land should be gradually applied, and gradually obeyed, in order to respect the unjust traditions of men, and to give free reign and honor to destructive prejudices.

9. We intend to take every legal step to employ every constructive measure, and to cooperate with every group of loyal Americans in the struggle to preserve all of the Nation's ideals, and to overcome every eco-

nomic, political, and cultural stumbling block that hinders the further progress of this great republic.

10. With love for our Nation, good will toward all, utter devotion to the Federal Constitution, and undying faith in God; we intend to continue our struggle for the complete victory of freedom on every front, and the preservation of the soul of the Nation whatever the cost. And if we are slain by the forces of oppression before our high purpose is achieved, we pray that we shall sleep under the shadows of the flag that we love, and our sacred dust shall be a silent testimony and a lasting memorial to our eternal quest for justice, peace, and good will.

#### LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for 20 years, Lowell Mason, a member of the Federal Trade Commission, has given an annual luncheon on the opening day of the baseball season. Yesterday, at the luncheon, there were in attendance members of the courts, members of the executive branch of the Government, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives. At the luncheon, Lowell Mason said what I think is a very beautiful grace, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the grace was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Our Father, Who shall say that those who make and those who administer our laws may serve without Thy help.

And who shall say they may receive it, except they be simple, gentle and humble, becoming as little children.

For no nation can be truly great whose servants do not have something childlike in their lives.

We must renew our youth with simple joys that re-create the jaded mind and revive the burdened soul.

This, we seek to do, here at this table where the armaments of life are absent.

Grant us this day the saving touch of friendship, for in times of conflict, friendship is the quality that keeps open the lines of communication. May this happy noon-time help to refill the reservoirs of our spirit, give us courage greater than our fears and strength more adequate to our tasks.

Bless and guide our President and all who direct and lead our Nation that it may carry out Thy purpose. Amen.

#### THE LONG-RANGE APPROACH TO MEDICAL LEARNING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the health of our people is the most important resource belong to the United States. Unless men, women, and children are protected from the ravages of disease, our entire Nation is poor indeed. Few Members of Congress have been more conscientious and diligent in advocating a sound research and medical program to safeguard the health of Americans than the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

In the April 21, 1956, issue of the Saturday Review, Senator SMITH has written a cogent and effective article proposing that \$1 billion be spent to improve our knowledge of disease and in the means of preventing it. I doubt

if anyone could read her impressive argument without being convinced by it.

So that all Members of the Senate may be enlightened by the excellent article written by the senior Senator from Maine, I ask unanimous consent that the article by the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, entitled "Billion-Dollar Prescription", from the April 21 issue of the Saturday Review, be reprinted at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We human beings act strangely. With the exception of our moral and spiritual values, the obviously most important thing to us is life, our own life and the lives of our dear ones and our friends. Yet we don't act that way. We pay little attention to our health. We take our health for granted. We don't get concerned about it until we have lost part of it. And sometimes that is too late.

Here in America last year we spent \$10 billion for cocktails and other spirituous liquors. We spent \$5 billion for tobacco. We spent \$264 million for chewing gum. But when I advocated on the floor of the United States Senate that we spend an extra \$200 million a year for the next 5 years on the better care of our health, some people were shocked.

"How could you possibly spend that much money?" these people have asked. "Why \$200 million a year for 5 years is \$1 billion!" Indeed it is. One billion. Forty-nine billions less than our drinking bill during those same 5 years. Twenty-four billions less than our smoking bill. More than \$250 million less than our bill for chewing gum.

Having made that comparison, I ask my questioners a question:

"Is \$1 billion really a huge sum to spend to help protect and perhaps prolong 165 million American lives?"

I think most people will agree that it is not. And here is my prescription:

1. For medical research, spend \$500 million.

2. For medical research facilities, spend \$150 million.

3. For assistance to medical education, spend \$350 million.

I believe that my prescription is unique in one very important respect. It is long-range medicine, something that we in this country have never attempted before.

As I am not a doctor, or even a nurse, I may be suspected of snap diagnosis. This, however, is not the case. I have been concerned with medical research for a long time. I do want to acknowledge, though, that my thinking was crystallized by an editorial in a great Maine newspaper, the Bangor Daily News. The title the editorial writer chose was "How About \$1 Billion for Health?"

The most thorough study to date of the impact of illness upon our national economy was made in a 6-month-long investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 and 1954. I have leaned heavily upon my readings of those hearings in reaching my own conclusions. More recently, criticism of inadequate Federal support for medical research has come from the distinguished reports of the Hoover Commission. In these reports there is a recurrent plea for a 5-year program. I am frank to state that the arguments of the Commission have had a great influence upon me. But the detailed dosage that follows is my own formula.

#### 1. MEDICAL RESEARCH

At present the research and training programs of the National Institutes of Health have a current budget of approximately \$100 million a year. I would double this budget, making it \$200 million a year, an added 5-year cost of \$500 million.

Perhaps I should explain, for the benefit of those who are not so close to Government as I am, that the National Institutes of Health together make up the foremost research agency of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They have extensive laboratories of their own, probably the finest laboratories in the world, certainly the best Government laboratories anywhere. But two-thirds of their funds are spent in support of research and training in non-Federal medical institutions. In this extramural research and training each institute (there are seven—cancer, heart, mental health, arthritis and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases and blindness, dental, and microbiological) is aided by a National Advisory Council. Council members are citizens outstanding in medical science, education, and public affairs. They review all applications for grants and make recommendations on these to the Surgeon General, who in his turn requests appropriations from Congress.

Historically, the Councils have been hampered by our system of annual appropriations. Frequently they have not been able to attract the most qualified men to short-term jobs. And many research projects have been turned down because their continuance over the necessary span of time could not be guaranteed.

The more fundamental research becomes—and all the experts agree that it is fundamental (sometimes called pure) research we need above all else—the less predictable is the time involved. Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee early in 1956 reminded us, for instance, that 33 years passed between (a) the time that the pancreas was found to contain the secret of diabetes and (b) the time when the secret was identified as insulin. Would anyone today begrudge the money spent in hunting down that elusive chemical which, when finally discovered, saved millions of lives?

By making \$500 million more available to the National Institutes of Health, I do not claim to solve the problem of basic research. But I do feel that the Institutes would be given a degree of flexibility in supporting long-range studies. It seems pertinent to note at this point that long-range investigation means most in the little-understood metabolic diseases which have their worst crippling effects in our growing proportion of older citizens.

#### 2. MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Early this year Senators LISTER HILL and STYLES BRIDGES introduced a bill to provide \$90 million over the next 3 years to match construction grants for medical research facilities in medical schools, hospitals, and private foundations in all parts of the country. The Senate passed the bill unanimously, and the measure is now before the House. Under my 5-year prescription, I would extend this 3-year proposal to cover 5 years at the same annual rate of \$30 million—a total of \$150 million.

#### 3. MEDICAL EDUCATION AND ASSISTANCE

Senator HILL also introduced, together with a dozen other Senators, another bill to provide \$250 million to match grants for construction of medical-school buildings. This bill has been strongly endorsed by the American Medical Association and almost unanimously by medical school deans. I would increase this appropriation by \$20 million a year—from \$50 million to \$70 million—for a 5-year total of \$350 million. That total approximates two estimates made by the National Fund for Medical Education (of which Herbert Hoover is honorary president) regarding the needs of the Nation's medical schools.

My billion-dollar prescription is now complete.



I admit that \$1 billion may appear to be a large amount for taxpayers to carry in addition to the burden they carry at present. But I call your attention to the fact that the American people unhesitatingly footed a 1954 bill of \$1,700,000,000 for research on military weapons alone. This is eight-and-one-half times the annual rate I propose for medical research expansion. May I point out that our national defense and our national security are no stronger than our national health, on which our Federal Government's research spending is less than 1 percent of the national budget?

Compare the current \$100 million research and training budget of the National Institutes of Health with the \$90 million appropriated at the last session of Congress for research activities in the Department of Agriculture. Add to this \$90 million the sum of \$250 million which is paid out to farmers for soil conservation. I do not want to imply that I am not heartily in favor of greatly expanded agricultural research. I know, of course, that much of such research benefits us in our studies of the diseases of man. And I have always supported farm-research activities. But I think it is about time this country brought research on human lives up to the level of research on animals and plants.

I referred earlier to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the impact of disease on the national economy. The committee found that four diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370 million man-days of work and that the annual cost to the Nation from all illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total income-tax revenue, or \$30 billion a year. Alongside that enormous loss, my proposed expenditures of \$200 million a year would seem a very modest investment.

Would it be a sound investment for a banker?

Over the last decade alone medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American. We all know something of the wonders of penicillin, streptomycin, isoniazid, cortisone, and a host of other fighters against disease. These miraculous products of medical research, along with new surgical techniques and blood plasma, have brought about these percentage reductions in the death rates of some of the major killers and cripples:

	Percent
Influenza.....	77
Appendicitis.....	69
Acute rheumatic fever.....	66
Syphilis.....	56
Tuberculosis.....	50
Pneumonia.....	50
Kidney diseases.....	43

Now let us translate this into economic terms. The National Office of Vital Statistics reported that in 1954 approximately 350,000 Americans under the age of 65 died of cancer and heart disease alone. This is greater than the total of Americans who lost their lives in the Armed Forces during the Second World War and the Korean war together. Remember that those wars last not 1 year but approximately 7 years.

Those 350,000 deaths of 1954 occurred, as I have stated, among people under 65, people in their productive years who otherwise would have been at work, earning money, producing goods and services, and consuming as well. Moreover, these people would have been paying taxes which would have gone, in part, to pay for research which would have helped to preserve their own and other lives.

In an earlier year—the year 1951—a study of federally aided rehabilitation revealed that 8,000 people who were returned to work had been on public assistance prior to re-

habilitation, at a cost of \$5,700,000 annually. The cost of their rehabilitation was \$4 million. These people are now employed. Instead of being tax-consumers they are taxpayers.

When we consider that chronic diseases account for 88 percent of the disability of the approximately 2 million physically handicapped people in the United States, we can see that the economic benefits to be derived from medical research on disabling diseases would be vast. The research would more than pay for itself.

I have been asked whether my billion dollar prescription for our national health amounts to socialized medicine. I have publicly and privately stated for many, many years that I am opposed to socialized medicine. The 5-year program that I propose would have no aspects of socialized medicine. It is in keeping with recommendations and endorsements made by the Hoover Commission, the American Medical Association, medical-school deans, and such outstanding doctors as Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who treated President Eisenhower.

Perhaps because he is the heart doctor of the President, Dr. White's own words have a great dramatic and impressive meaning to the American people on the need for expansion of medical research. Dr. White has pointed out that current heart research is severely limited because of lack of money. Testifying before a Senate committee, as a member of the advisory council of the National Heart Institute, Dr. White said he had been forced to use his own money for research because there were not sufficient Government funds.

His was only one of a tremendous backlog of worthy projects, running into millions of dollars, for which the advisory councils have no money. As long as this backlog exists qualified people are being denied the opportunity to save life.

If one of the Armed Forces can build up a 25-year supply of hamburgers, and if another can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a fighter plane that could not fly, I say we can afford to appropriate funds to give our children and our children's children the best in medicine.

#### STUDY OF 19TH SOVIET PARTY CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, several months before Stalin died, the Research Institute of America, Inc., made an extensive study of the 19th Soviet Party Congress. My colleagues may remember that I brought this study to the attention of the Senate, as well as to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations. This study caused considerable comment in the Congress and around the country. The same Institute, under the executive direction of Mr. Leo Cherne, has recently completed another such study entitled "Toughest Challenge Yet in New Soviet Strategy." This study, like its predecessor, is an instructive analysis of the new challenge facing us. The fact that it is frightening as well, makes it all the more imperative that we take it seriously.

I would certainly welcome the comments of the State Department upon the analysis which has been made by the Research Institute of America. I regret to say that the Department did not give us a response to a similar analysis and study which I presented in the Senate about a year and a half ago. I can think of no subject matter which is more important than the one to which I refer.

Furthermore, the Research Institute of America is an accredited, respected, acknowledged, competent research establishment in the field of foreign affairs. The study which I bring to the attention of my colleagues is one which I think will bear their closest examination. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this study, as it appeared in a special report to the members of the Research Institute of America, Inc., be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TOUGHEST CHALLENGE YET IN NEW SOVIET STRATEGY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—These are the hard facts: economic and military strength of the Moscow-directed one-third of the globe is rising steadily. The new Soviet leaders' domestic and foreign policies are far more subtle and shrewd than those of Stalin. Most important, the new Soviet policies have been astonishingly successful. It adds up to this: right now, we and our allies are losing the battle against world communism.)

For a bird's eye view of how Soviet strategy threatens United States supply of key raw materials today, take a look at the map on pages 6 and 7 of this report. Then, ask yourself these questions:

How did this happen? Which events are really responsible for this state of affairs? Do we know what the Soviet Union plans to do in the coming months? Is there still time to thwart the Kremlin's plans? How can the West prevent the present military stalemate from becoming a checkmate?

Here are the conclusions of the Research Institute's experts who, with Harry Schwartz, the New York Times specialist on Russia, have been closely following developments behind the Iron Curtain—the shifting events which culminated in the new policy statements proclaimed at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow this February.

#### The Soviet leadership

When Stalin ruled the Soviet empire with an iron fist, Khrushchev and Bulganin helped execute his policies—and his opponents. When the aging Stalin conducted Soviet foreign policy in full battle dress, Khrushchev and Bulganin were among his toughest lieutenants. But Stalin's rigidities during his last years resulted in strong anti-Communist countermeasures by the West. So, in order to weaken Western resistance to the Communist advance, the new Soviet leaders have gone back to the more flexible—and effective—policies that Stalin himself used in the 1930's, while pretending to repudiate Stalin's policies and actually destroying his place in Soviet mythology.

Chalking up Communist gains in India, Indonesia, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, the new Soviet leaders have also largely resolved the domestic problem of Stalin's succession, and they have done so without wrecking the Stalinist system and without an excess of bloodshed and purges. Only one of the original contenders for Stalin's throne, Beria, had to be shot, and only two, Malenkov and Molotov, had to be humiliated publicly.

Although a muted struggle for power in the Soviet hierarchy must continue until all possible opposition to a single dictator has been silenced, for all practical purposes Nikita S. Khrushchev—First Secretary of the Communist Party—is Stalin's successor today.

Despite the talk in Moscow about "collective leadership," the fact is that Khrushchev controls the reins of power. He alone in the Soviet Union today stands above criticism and need not acknowledge past mistakes (all errors can now be blamed on

Stalin and Beria, who are safely dead), even though at least one colossal Khrushchev boner—the enormous program to plow and plant 75 million acres of grain in arid parts of Siberia—proved to be an expensive folly last year.

Khrushchev, like Stalin in the early days, is busy accruing personal prestige and downgrading possible opponents while putting his own followers into positions of power. He does not yet have the enormous prestige that Stalin enjoyed after he led Russia to victory against Hitler. Khrushchev may not have the time to win a comparable position of absolute supremacy—he is over 60, Stalin was well under 50 when control slipped from Lenin's dying hands. Khrushchev, unlike Stalin, has to listen to—even if not heed—the members of his "team" before making decisions. But Khrushchev has the tremendous advantage of Stalin's experience and can therefore avoid the foreign policy blunders of his predecessor while working for absolute dictatorial control.

Khrushchev—unlike Stalin—must take notice of the interests of key groups who control great power levers in the state, particularly the army. The unprecedented elevation of Marshal Zhukov to the top dozen of Soviet rulers is the most vivid proof. Stalin was far too aware of the possibility of a military coup d'état to give such stature to a military man. Today, the promotion of Zhukov to a high-party post assures solid military support of the regime; also, some of Zhukov's immense popularity, won in wartime, now rubs off on the ruling clique. But Zhukov's promotion puts him too close to the throne for Khrushchev's comfort—if anything goes wrong.

#### *Khrushchev—limited dictator*

To sum up: Khrushchev rules Russia today, but only with the advice and consent of his immediate colleagues in the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The members of this body give every evidence of understanding that an out-and-out battle among them could destroy the whole Soviet power position as well as endanger their own lives. There are still rivalries and disagreements, but these are now being subordinated to the task of increasing worldwide Communist power.

Should Khrushchev die, should Soviet foreign policy be forced to suffer a major setback, the quiescent struggle for Stalin's mantle could flare up again, as it did in the spring of 1953. But for the time being, there is stability—a tremendous asset to the Soviet state.

#### *Within Russia: less unrest*

One of the great assets of the West after World War II was the restlessness and resentment of the stanchest anti-Communists of all: the people of Russia who live under the boot of totalitarianism. A Western policy of strength kept alive the spark of freedom in the Russian people. That spark may now be going out because of the inertia of the West. Should it expire, the West will have lost its army of allies who live on the enemy's home ground.

Why has this happened? First, at Geneva last summer, whatever the intent of the Western leaders, the impression was given to the whole world, including the people behind the Iron Curtain, that we actually believed in the possibility that the Russian leaders wanted to coexist with us. The people most discouraged by the spurious spirit of Geneva were the anti-Communists behind the Russian curtain.

Second, Stalin's successors have realized that accumulated pressure under a sewer cover can blow the lid sky high. To lessen the pressure under their regime, they have gone part of the way toward meeting some of the basic grievances of the Russian people.

The new leaders have sharply increased peasants' incomes by raising prices paid for

farm produce, including grain, livestock products, potatoes, etc. They have increased the supply of food and consumer goods for the population, going so far even as to buy large quantities of meat and butter abroad to make up for deficient home production. They have given greater priority to housing construction. And they have cut the average workweek down to 46 hours, with further reduction promised.

They have curbed the power of the secret police and executed some of the highest police leaders. They have loosened the shackles on the intellectuals so that writers can write somewhat more freely and scientists can communicate more easily with foreign scientists.

They have promised a number of major additional concessions in the next year or two: the end of tuition fees in high schools and colleges, higher pay for the lowest paid workers, higher pensions for the millions of aged pensioners whose government payments now are so completely inadequate that even men and women of 75 and 80 must work to avoid starvation.

The upper ranks of the Soviet bureaucracy have been given a device to permit them to pass on their superior status to their children. This is the system of boarding schools—Soviet Etons and Harrows—which Khrushchev announced will be set up to train the Soviet leaders of tomorrow.

An effort is being made to heal the deep wounds left by Stalin's purges of the 1930's. Many of the victims are to be rehabilitated, and where such rehabilitation is posthumous, suitable recompense will presumably be made to the victims' surviving families. The sickening adulation of Stalin and the most obvious falsification of history are to be ended; at least, that is the promise.

All this adds up to a considerable revolution for a period of 3 years. It has not been accomplished without cost, including a substantial inflationary pressure which is causing Khrushchev great concern. The economic concessions—which still leave the Soviet standard of living and the degree of freedom in the Soviet Union far from satisfactory to its own people—have probably strengthened the regime at home on balance, but they raise the question of whether the population will not demand more. The problem will be particularly acute in the next few years when the Soviet leaders expect to be able to reduce high prices only slowly. A great deal depends on what the West will do to increase the internal pressures against the Red regime. Strong opposition to Soviet moves in Asia and the Middle East would help to reactivate a spirit of resistance inside the Iron Curtain.

#### *Red military strength*

Stalin's successors have essentially ended American nuclear monopoly and created what is for all practical purposes a military stalemate. In the past 3 years they have produced powerful hydrogen bombs, and long-distance jet bombers capable of delivering such bombs to American cities. They hint, and possibly not without some justification, that they are ahead of the United States in developing long-range guided and ballistic missiles. These are historic accomplishments. They have fundamentally changed the world balance of power as against what it was when Stalin died in March 1953. In these accomplishments lies much of the explanation for the Soviet leaders' present genuine confidence.

#### *Red diplomacy ascending*

Stalin's successors have made deep inroads among the neutral nations of the world. Khrushchev and Bulganin's trip to India, Burma, and Afghanistan raised Soviet prestige greatly in those countries. The swap of Czechoslovakia arms for Egyptian cotton, plus the all-out Kremlin support for the

Arab nations in their dispute with Israel, have greatly heightened Soviet influence throughout the strategic and oil-rich Middle East. Pakistan, a key link to the free world chain of alliances in Asia, has been softened up by trade offers from Russia and sweet words from Communist China. Marshal Tito's regime in Yugoslavia, once clearly an ally of the free world because of Stalin's excommunication of Tito, has been nudged out of the Western camp closer to the Soviet bloc. The result of these and similar measures has been that the prestige of the West, particularly the United States, has plummeted in many parts of the world while Moscow's and Peking's influence has soared.

It is clear even from the brief recital above that we now face a much more dangerous and wily foe than we did in Stalin's last years. His successors, on his passing, took a penetrating look at the legacy he had left. They identified the weak spots in their positions at home and abroad, and took drastic action to revise their policy accordingly. All this has resulted in a new chapter of modern history to which Western policy has not adequately adjusted itself.

#### *THE COMMUNIST PLANS FOR THE FUTURE*

At the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow in February 1956, Khrushchev and company unveiled their plans for exploiting the new world situation for their own benefit. The long-range Communist strategy is now based on the following premises:

No major nuclear war is likely for the foreseeable future. This is the meaning of Khrushchev's new dictum that there is no "fatal inevitability" of war. Russia intends to keep militarily strong, and its leaders do not exclude the possibility of little wars which might grow into big ones. Soviet leaders now base their plans on the assumption that a military stalemate exists between them and the free world, and that therefore, other weapons—political and economic in the main—must be relied on to attain their goals.

#### *Soviet progress to date*

The economic power of the Soviet bloc will grow very rapidly during the foreseeable future, increasing the Communist potential for victory. This rapid growth is already exerting a tremendous magnetic effect upon the underdeveloped countries now searching for quick roads to industrialization. Communist influence will grow in the underdeveloped countries if the Communist nations can show the ability to increase production, raise standards of living, health, and education, and to modernize formerly backward areas. You should know that particular importance is being attached to North Korea where, with great cooperation from other Communist countries, Moscow is trying to create a showplace of economic recovery intended to contrast with inflation-ridden South Korea. Should the plan succeed, it could exercise tremendous influence over all Asia.

The Communist confidence in their ability to grow rapidly in the future is largely based on the beanstalking of the Soviet economy in the past 10 years. Perhaps the most dramatic evidence—though not entirely pertinent to the future—is the record of the Soviet production increase between 1945 and 1955 as shown below:

Commodity	Unit	1945	1955
Coal	Million metric tons	149.3	390.1
Petroleum	do	19.4	70.7
Electricity	Billion kilowatt-hours	43.2	170.2
Pig iron	Million metric tons	8.9	33.3
Steel	do	12.3	45.2
Cotton cloth	Billion meters	1.6	8.9
Leather shoes	Million pairs	64.5	297.4



The expansion shown in this table cannot be sustained since it was the result of very special conditions. It was easier to rebuild war damaged plants after 1945 than it is to build new ones from scratch. The Russians moved billions of dollars worth of machinery and raw materials from Eastern Europe and Manchuria to their own factories. The level of productivity in the early post-war years was so low that it was comparatively easy to raise it rapidly. Yet, even after allowance has been made for such special factors, it is clear that an impressive job of industrial reconstruction and expansion was accomplished in Russia this past decade.

#### New Russian economic goals

The Soviet leadership fully realizes that their country has tremendous reserves of untapped raw materials, particularly in the area beyond the Urals. In the past few years they have found extensive deposits of iron ore, coal, petroleum, bauxite, rare metals, uranium, and the like. The great rivers of Siberia have an enormous electric power potential. All these vast resources are scheduled to be exploited in the years immediately ahead. The final goal is not only to outproduce the United States but also to turn out more steel, coal, electricity, and the like, per capita, than this country.

Of course, these ambitious goals are set in comparison with present United States output figures. They ignore the further expansion which will inevitably occur in this country. However, even in these terms, the advances which Soviet leaders are seeking are impressive (same units as above):

United States 1955 actual	Commodity	Soviet Russia		
		1955 actual	1960 goal	1965 probable goal <sup>1</sup>
448	Coal.....	390.1	593	700
332	Petroleum.....	70.7	135	200
623	Electricity.....	179.2	320	600
70.9	Pig iron.....	33.3	53	70
106	Steel.....	45.2	68.3	90

<sup>1</sup> Research Institute estimates based on Soviet statements.

The essential point of this table is that by 1965 Soviet leaders hope to come very close to the output levels now prevailing in the United States. This means that unless we can maintain an equal rate of expansion the gap between the two economies will have been narrowed significantly within these next 10 years.

Moreover, since the great bulk of Soviet production goes for capital equipment and arms—not for passenger cars and other consumer durable goods—they expect to surpass the United States in machinery output earlier than 1965. So far as armaments go, of course, the maintenance of a high level of preparedness will be far less burdensome on the Soviet economy when and if it produces seventy to ninety million tons of steel, than is true now.

Of course there is no certainty that the Soviet leaders will reach the indicated goals by 1960 and 1965. They are counting on a substantial increase in productivity through the widespread introduction of automation, and on an ability to continue giving heavy industry a higher priority than consumer goods. The odds are that rapid Soviet economic growth will continue.

The Soviet leaders' perspectives go beyond their own country to the Communist bloc as a whole—a bloc which now embraces over one-third of mankind. For the longer pull, Moscow hopes that Communist China will become one of the world's great economic powers. Already the addition to Communist power provided by Eastern Europe and Communist Asia is not negligible, and the Com-

munists intend it shall grow as the following table shows (same units as above):

United States, Britain, France, West Germany 1955 actual	Commodity	Total Soviet bloc 1955 actual <sup>1</sup>	Total Soviet bloc 1960 goal <sup>1</sup>
862.5	Coal.....	830	1,255
336	Petroleum.....	85	163
823	Electricity.....	240	425
160.2	Steel.....	60	91

<sup>1</sup> Research Institute estimates.

#### Soviet strategy against the West

The Communist leaders believe that the phenomenal economic progress of the free world, particularly the United States, is nearing its end, and a major capitalist depression is in the offing. Khrushchev ended his analysis of the current state of world capitalism with the declaration that "capitalism is steadily moving towards new economic and social upheavals." If the difficulties they hope for come, the Soviet Union and its allies will know full well how to take advantage of the economic, social, and political disorganization they would produce.

It does not matter that Soviet hopes for a full-scale depression are doomed to disappointment—at least as far as the United States is concerned. Several of the economies of Western Europe continue to show a slower rate of economic progress; even more significant is the fact that they are far more vulnerable to the possibility of recession than is the United States. And Russia is no longer betting blindly on the inevitability of an economic collapse in the West.

Soviet leaders now regret Stalin's earlier adventures—such as the Korean war—which forced the West to rearm. This rearmament, they have now come to believe, is the main reason why the depression has not come about. In part, the Soviet campaign for disarmament now is motivated by the belief that any substantial decline of Western arms production could really mean a collapse of Western economies; at the same time they argue publicly that for them a decline in arms would be helpful in freeing resources for developing their economy.

The result of this caution is that Communist theorists have decided that world capitalism—meaning the United States and Western Europe—has a fatal weakness aside from the possibility of a full-scale depression. This is the United States and Western dependence on imported raw materials from Asia, Africa, and South America. A writer in Pravda recently pointed out that well over half of all the free world's reserves of such vital resources as oil, iron ore, manganese, chrome, tin, diamonds, cobalt, copper, bauxite, uranium, lithium, graphite, natural rubber, and other major raw materials is to be found in the underdeveloped countries. In the Communist view, any tactic which tends to cut the United States and Western Europe off from these raw materials sources strikes at the real foundations of Western strength. Also, the narrower the raw material base available to the Western World the narrower the market for the West's manufactured products and the more intense the rivalries of western countries for the available sources and markets. It is from this reasoning that the current, and so far effective, Communist propaganda and aid campaign has proceeded in the underdeveloped countries.

On the basis of all these factors, Communist leaders now believe that, by using a varied series of tactics, they can conquer world capitalism without exposing themselves unduly to the risk of an all-out nuclear war. With greatly expanded resources at their disposal, the Communists

now are ready to play for the long pull as they have never done before, taking temporary disadvantages in stride if that be necessary. Economic, psychological, and political warfare—all closely coordinated—will be stepped up. The objective will be to wreck all western political and military alliances, weaken or destroy political and economic links among free nations, incite wars or near-wars wherever possible, and create Communist or Communist-dominated governments wherever possible.

The targets and pattern of this intensified Communist onslaught on the sources of our strategic raw materials throughout the world are dramatically illustrated in the map which you will find in the centerfold (pp. 6 and 7) of this report.

#### The new economic war

Economic weapons to be used against us include:

Communist offers of greatly increased trade to countries which drop the embargo on strategic exports to the Communist bloc.

Offers of Soviet aid in industrialization—in the form of technicians, know-how, and capital goods in return for domestic agricultural and raw material surpluses. Available, too, will be Communist loans on easy terms with long repayment periods and interest at 2 percent or less. Atomic energy will spearhead this aspect of the Soviet offensive. Reactors, uranium, and atomic know-how will be offered to every underdeveloped country that will play ball with Moscow. Egypt and Yugoslavia have already accepted such offers.

No country is going to get Soviet aid as charity. Along with the technicians will come the ready crew of agents, spies, and propagandists. Every gift grant will be tied to Soviet strategy. The difference is that the strings on Soviet aid are unobtrusive while the reasons for United States aid are ventilated in the Halls of Congress, in the columns of the press, and in the red-taped chambers of bureaucracy. Moreover, we often don't get legitimate credit for our aid, while local Communists in recipient countries make sure that every incoming Soviet brick sounds like a housing development.

Offers of stable markets in Communist areas at prices guaranteed for long terms to countries having particularly valuable raw materials. This tactic will be particularly attractive to underdeveloped countries now enjoying the high prices of the present boom period, but fearful of a possible bust around the corner.

Where politically desirable, and taking the other extreme, the Communists will be ready to dump other key commodities at prices well below comparable western levels. Cost of production will be ignored in such dumping where the political prize is important enough.

Disorganization of some international markets which is likely to result from American disposal of some agricultural surpluses—cotton almost immediately—will be used by the Communists to cement economic bonds with countries hurt by the American program. The Communist maneuvers with respect to Egyptian cotton and Burmese rice already illustrate these possibilities.

In all this, remember the great Communist advantage: the state has a free hand in disposing of its resources. Neither the necessity of making a profit nor the domestic needs of the people hamper the Kremlin's ability to engage in freewheeling economic warfare. In the past, the Soviet Union promised much, delivered little. But now we can expect fewer token deliveries, fewer empty promises. Instead, there will be genuine offers of long-term aid—with completion of delivery contingent on the continuation of a favorable attitude toward the Soviet Union, thus tying long-term apron strings to the U. S. S. R. Moscow puts such high priority on the political gains it expects to win from these tactics, that it will make delivery even at great cost. But Soviet resources are not

limitless, and the magnitude of what the Communists can do in this direction will grow only as their domestic production increases. Any sharp setback in their domestic economies—such as a major crop failure—would necessarily affect this campaign. But for the time being the outlook is for an indefinite and rapid expansion of this kind of economic warfare—starting, to be sure, from a very low present level of foreign trade and assistance.

#### *The new political war*

At the 20th party congress, Khrushchev acknowledged that: "there may be different roads to socialism. Rather than all countries being bound by the Soviet pattern, Moscow now calls for Communist united fronts with all leftists, Socialists, and the like all over the world."

This is not a new line, as some suppose, but the reactivation of one of Lenin's early policies. It was also used effectively by the Stalin regime during the "popular front" period of the late 1930's. For the most part, however, under Stalin even the slightest deviation from his line was denounced and severely punished. Notably, the powerful Socialist parties of Western Europe were denounced as Fascists, agents of the capitalists, etc., and where the Communists seized power in Eastern Europe, Socialists were among the first victims murdered or imprisoned. The result has been that this past decade the Socialist parties of West Europe, except in Italy, have been among the most important anti-Communist bulwarks.

Now Khrushchev has changed the line and is wooing the Socialists, inviting their leaders to Moscow, and loudly asserting that the important thing is the unity of all workers' parties. The immediate chief target is France, where the goal is the formation of a Communist-Socialist government which would take France out of NATO. But ultimately the campaign could have repercussions all over the world, from Japan to England, the Soviets hope, with leftist Socialists and Communists working together in far stronger force than the Communists could attain alone.

Some top Socialist leaders in Europe have already indicated they will not allow the wool to be pulled over their eyes. But there is less understanding of the true nature of communism among the leaders of the new Asian countries, such as India, Burma, and Indonesia, who are primarily socialistic in their orientation. Communist assurances that how a nation becomes Socialist is unimportant can be a potent force in bringing those countries closer to the Soviet Union. Addressing the British workers, the Soviet leaders take the position that past hostility to the Laborites was Beria's crime, and say in effect that Russia wants nothing more than a Labor Britain.

It should be noted that on this issue, the Soviet leaders have pretended to take a leaf from Tito's book. Actually, the policy is Lenin's but Khrushchev knows that countries like India prefer to think it's Tito's, hence this expedient camouflage—made possible by the fact that Tito has been urging such proposals for a year or more.

#### *The new psychological war*

The desegregation crisis in the Southern States has given the world Communist movement a giant propaganda handle which it has latched on to with its customary resourcefulness. Every new tension between Negroes and whites in the South is being publicized among the majority of the world's people who are colored. Needless to say, the extraordinary progress made by the Negro in the United States over the last 90 years and particularly in the most recent past, is virtually unknown among the nations being beset by Soviet propaganda. The result has already been a greater and greater hostility to the United States. To a lesser but still

significant extent the similar struggle in South Africa is serving the Communist cause. And because the United States is a major buyer of South African uranium, diamonds, and other minerals, this country will be blamed more and more for not exerting economic pressure against the rulers of South Africa. The South African problem is a particularly potent propaganda weapon in India, because Indian natives of South Africa are among the victims of South Africa's policies.

#### SOVIET PROBLEMS AND WEAKNESSES

The picture painted above is not an encouraging one, but it is offset to some extent by the difficulties faced by the Communist leaders.

1. Soviet agriculture is still very sick. Khrushchev has staked his prestige on being able to just about double Soviet food production by 1960 through his virgin lands wheat program, his corn-hog program and other measures. Most of his program failed last year, but an extraordinarily good harvest in the Ukraine saved the day. He is now gambling that weather in Siberia will permit his virgin lands program to begin producing results this year. Another repetition of last year's drought there, plus a poorer harvest in the Ukraine, could shake even his position. But there is no foreseeable danger of widespread starvation. The Soviet Union has enough bread; what its people want are more meat and dairy products for a better quality diet.

2. Khrushchev's ambitious industrialization program for the next 5 years, plus his aid commitments to China, Eastern Europe, and such countries as India, are likely to strain the Soviet economy greatly. A tremendous capital-construction program must be carried out in the now unpopulated wastes of Siberia to achieve the production goals. Khrushchev is counting on major productivity gains, but he may soon find he cannot do all the things his program calls for and that he will have to cut back on some elements of his economic plans. Traditionally in such a situation the Communists have cut down consumer goods and investment in agriculture. But to do so again would raise serious problems of popular morale as well as throw more fuel on fires of domestic inflation. The pledge to raise low wage rates and low pensions will have to be fulfilled soon and will add appreciably to the gap between consumer demand and available goods.

3. The entire system of wages and salaries must be revised in order to raise work norms and to increase the pressure on workers and executives to do a good job. But any such wholesale revision in the wage and salary structure inevitably means stepping on many toes. Kaganovich has already said the changes must be made slowly, a sure tip-off of the Soviet leaders' fears on the matter.

4. The Chinese Communists have recently socialized their industry and trade and collectivized their agriculture with a speed that is without parallel, and so far with only relatively minor resistance. But as the full implications of this socialization are felt by the people affected, resistance may rise sharply. Peiping's demands on its people are sharpening as industrialization and its capital requirements are speeded up. There could be internal difficulties in China which would cause Peiping to turn to Moscow for more help—appeals that might well come at a time when Moscow's own resources are strained. As the Chinese hear about Soviet offers of assistance all over the world, some of them at least must wonder why there isn't more generous aid for China.

5. One weakness, not to be discounted, is the Kremlin's adherence to Communist dogma. For instance, after the 20th party congress, Khrushchev announced his intention of proceeding with the abolition of personal farm plots, even though these have

proved to be much more productive per acre than the collective farms.

Here, realism is being ditched for dogma, a step which must be chalked up as a weakness of the system.

#### THE CHALLENGES TO THE UNITED STATES

On balance, it's difficult to be encouraging about the foreseeable future, even when the weaknesses of the Communist world are taken into account. However, the free world's great assets of wealth and freedom are still as important as ever. If they have recently been less effective than in the past, it is because our policy has not used our assets as ruthlessly, cleverly, and with the same willingness to sacrifice as the Communists have used theirs. To a large extent, the outcome will depend on the kind of policy Washington and its allies formulate in response to a whole range of sharpened challenges from the Kremlin.

1. Who will win the educational race? The Russians expect to overtake our economic superiority by producing more engineers, technicians, and scientists. This manpower challenge is already near the point of crisis. With a current shortage of engineers, we find fewer high schools teaching mathematics, physics, and so forth, so that fewer graduates are eligible for scientific study in the colleges. The vicious cycle finds fewer teachers available because the qualified men have found it more profitable to spend their time in industry.

The Russians, on the other hand, are concentrating their state-controlled educational system on producing technicians, to the neglect of other studies. The importance of their lead is sometimes exaggerated. Too many Russian technicians spend their time at paper work, and thus largely waste their training. Also, Russian technicians tend to overspecialize, thus making themselves obsolete when retooling and conversion are required. Nevertheless, Russian gains in the training of technicians make our own deficiencies seem appalling. In the immediate future, American businessmen will be asked by Washington to reverse the tide by releasing some of their best brains to instruct a new generation of scientists and technicians.

2. Who will win the economic race? We must resist the temptation to scoff at Russian hopes that their production will ever outstrip ours. There are clear warnings, both in the past and in the present:

The Russian hopes for a collapse of the United States economy are doomed to be disappointed. And yet, even a series of recessions, slowing down our growth, could be an invaluable aid to the Soviets during these next 10 years. The extent to which Communist plans have been realized in recent years definitely means that they can count on further sharp advances.

It may never become necessary for the Russians to fully match United States economic strength. The moment of historic peril will actually come much sooner: if and when the Russian workers' standard of living can be raised above that of the French and Italian working class. Our task really is to prevent even that much of a narrowing of the gap between the West and the Soviets.

Historically, the main challenge may well be whether or not we can continue to expand our own economy and those of our Western allies, maintain the well-being of business, provide new jobs for a growing population, increase investments for new industries and raise purchasing power to absorb more consumer goods.

3. Foreign trade and investment. We are already engaged in competition for trade ties with other countries. Foreign aid giveaways are not a sufficient answer to this challenge. Postwar gifts aimed at emergency stabilization did their job in preventing Communist capture of depressed and disillusioned countries. But for the long



haul, the pattern will have to be "trade not aid."

Here the challenge is who can offer the best terms, who can absorb more of the products that the underdeveloped countries want to sell—the state economy of Russia or the free economy of the West?

The Russians are free to use their maneuverability as a world weapon. Part of our problem is that domestic investment may well be more profitable and involve less risk during the critical years than investment in the underdeveloped areas. Look for increased Washington action along the lines of point 4 to meet the challenge of Russian bids. Also expect some increased Government regulation aimed at restraining American businessmen from competing with the economic interests of countries we are wooing, especially in the Middle East and Asia. Current legal requirements like the Buy-American Act and provisions for shipping foreign-aid goods in American bottoms may go by the board. In general, disparities between private business practices and the policies of the State Department will come in for a strong scrutiny—and this will be true regardless of which political party is in power.

4. Can Russia choke us off from vital raw materials? Clearer recognition of this Soviet policy (as pictured on the map in the center fold of this report) will bring a variety of responses from the United States. More attention will be given to stockpiling and to the development of substitute materials. But the main test will continue to be whether Americans are sufficiently adept at the international game to keep our lifelines open in the face of a 5-fold pincer action by the Russians:

Guerrilla warfare, as in the jungles of Malaya, whose tin and rubber we need.

Bribery, with gold or guns, as in the Middle East where oil is the prize.

Support of nationalist aspirations, as in North Africa, whose territory provides important military bases or impinges on commercial lanes for the West.

Endorsement of territorial claims—for example, to Kashmir and Goa, in the case of India which is the source of most of our manganese.

Political penetration through neutralism or popular front governments—techniques that have been cultivated in France, Italy, Indonesia, Ceylon, etc.

5. The need for domestic unity. The Russians are not abandoning any of their old weapons merely because they have devised new ones. They will continue to use the fifth column tactics of espionage and infiltration into Government agencies, unions, political parties, church groups, fraternal organizations, etc. The popular front tactic that proved so successful in the thirties has been dusted off again. Inside the United States, the Communists will seek every opportunity to enlarge and exploit new internal tensions like those in the South over integration. Part of the new challenge is whether or not our domestic disputes can be resolved quickly and with a minimum of violence.

6. Who will win the psychological war? The Kremlin's effort now is to identify Russians as blood-brothers of the Asians. They are utilizing history effectively—identifying the West with colonialism; reminding Asians that Russia only recently emerged from the status of an underdeveloped nation herself; stressing the United States exclusion of immigration under the McCarran Act, etc. These are keyed to immediate pressures felt by the Asians.

We have valid and persuasive answers. And yet, we have labored under a real handicap, and continue to do so. Washington's psychological warfare has emphasized appeals that are valued in our culture—freedom, respect for the individual, self-govern-

ment, competition. All of these have—or will some day have—appeal. But we must adapt to the fact that the ambitions and needs of the people we are appealing to today are more basic and urgent. They are of necessity material. And, conditioned by centuries of authoritarian regimes, most of these underdeveloped nations cannot yet be expected to respond to the ideological appeal of Western democracies over the authoritarian call of the Russians. Ignorance abroad is a major Soviet asset, which they compound with their propaganda. As an illustration, India's first public opinion poll in West Bengal showed 31 percent thinking the United States was "willfully preparing for war" and only 2 percent thinking the Soviet was preparing.

7. Is time on the Kremlin's side? The Russians have reason to believe that the longer the current situation lasts, the more tempted people in many countries will be to accommodate themselves to a pattern that favors the Soviet. This trend has already started in Asia. Cambodia has broken her ties with the United States on the assumption that Red China's star is ascending. Great Britain has written off Formosa on the assumption that Chiang Kai-shek can't win. Even Pakistan, which the United States has helped at the price of increased Indian hostility, is interested in deals with Russia. Trade paves the way to political accommodation. Unless we can counter this trend, the danger is that our allies will drift into neutralism, and the neutrals will drift into a pro-Soviet orientation.

Washington and the free world are not without resources to oppose these challenges successfully. We're still far out front as an economic power; we have no designs on the well-being of other nations; we do not seek to impose our ideology on Asians.

These assets have not yet been brought to bear effectively in the war of resistance to Communist domination. Internal political considerations, party and regional interests, particular industry needs, have so far prevented a consistent national policy. Whether we can close ranks and intensify our resistance on a more organized basis is the fundamental challenge of our time, it is now clear.

8. Can the United States take the lead? The basis for a potentially powerful counter-offensive is sketched out in Bertram D. Wolfe's Six Keys to the Soviet System, published this month. Wolfe points out that we, not the Communists, are today the advocates of agrarian reform. We, not they, are the advocates of a genuine peace, with disarmament under full safeguards and controls. We, not they, are the champions of the rights and freedom of the worker—freedom to move, to change jobs, to organize, to assemble, to elect and control his own officials, to strike. It is we, not they, who support the most powerful loyalty in the modern world—nationalism—and who are the advocates of self-determination. "In short," says Wolfe, "the main weapons that the Bolsheviks thought they could use in the early days against the rest of the world—nationalism, labor rights, agrarian reform, abolition of poverty, an economy of abundance, anti-imperialism—are now in our hands."

It is up to us to use them.

#### LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last year Congress in its wisdom passed legislation allowing the Indian tribes of my State and other States to engage in 25-year leases. After nearly a year the regulations governing the issuing of these leases have been formulated by the Interior Department and tomorrow will appear in the Federal Register, and shortly thereafter will be available to all

people who are interested. This step opens a broad new vista for the Indian, whose lands formerly have been restricted to his own use—a use which in many cases could not be utilized by the Indian. Now when the land is leased to another Indian or to a white man it will produce revenue for the tribal fund. Congress, in its constant efforts to make better the lives of our Indian brothers, can well feel proud of this accomplishment, and I know that as the years roll by and the lease moneys roll into the coffers of the Indian funds, the Indians, too, will thank us for our action of last year.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the Arizona Republic of Sunday, April 15, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR LEASES PUT INDIANS IN SPOT TO BID FOR CAPITAL—MILLIONS POSSIBLE IN STATE

(By Gig Kneeland)

Vast free-enterprise developments on the Nation's 53 million acres of Indian lands are forecast as the result of new leasing regulations just announced by the Federal Government.

Agricultural and recreational improvements in Arizona alone could amount to many millions of dollars, it is believed.

Frederick M. Haverland, director of the Phoenix area Indian Office which supervises all reservations in Arizona, Utah, and Nevada except the Navaho, said first development under the long-term leasing law might be on the Colorado River Reservation near Parker.

Haverland's office is the Government's directing agency for some 8,700,000 acres of reservation lands in this State.

The huge Navaho Reservation, mostly in Arizona, but including parts of New Mexico and Utah, is under jurisdiction of the Gallup, N. Mex., area office.

The new leasing regulations, which put into effect an act of Congress approved last August, provide that some Indian lands may be leased for up to 25 years, with provision for a 25-year renewal.

The lease term-limit had been 5 years.

In all cases, approval of the tribal governments is required.

Under the new regulations, the long-term leases are available for business, recreational, and agricultural development.

Haverland said this could result in placing some 60,000 acres of river-bottom land under cultivation in the Colorado River Indian Reservation near Parker.

He also said it could mean the construction of lodges, boat landings, and other recreational facilities along the river, with the Indians getting the benefit of this long-range development.

Haverland said also that it could mean construction of feeder pens, and other developments on this State's reservation lands.

The Fort Apache Reservation, with headquarters at Whiteriver, already has developed some of its recreational areas as a tribal enterprise. The new regulations will permit the tribe to offer the long-term leases to non-Indians.

It also makes possible venture money in construction of motels and lodges on the San Carlos Apache Reservation.

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, in announcing the new regulations, said that the former 5-year limitation on leases had retarded development of the reservation areas.

"For many years," he said, "there has been little or no interest in leasing Indian lands for business, recreational, or other purposes that involved substantial investments which could be amortized only over a comparatively long period."

"As a result many Indian land owners have been deprived of valuable rental income from properties that are well situated for long-term leasing."

Duration of nonagricultural leases will be determined in each case by the money invested and the requirements for amortization, but agricultural leases are for 10 years except in special cases where the Interior Department may approve those up to 25 years.

#### THE VICIOUS PHYSICAL ATTACK ON VICTOR RIESEL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a courageous man lies in a hospital in New York, not knowing this day whether tomorrow will bring darkness or light. Pain is his reward for courage. But courage has many rewards, and while the moment of pain and doubt may be his medallion of bravery, the gratitude and admiration of millions of people will be his permanent recognition. I refer to Victor Riesel, whose fearless attempts to call to the attention of the public the racketeering practices of certain labor unions resulted in his being subjected to an attack with acid.

Mr. President, this attack represents a challenge to the new labor merger. Will this style of reprisal be allowed to go unchallenged and to continue within the framework of the unions, or will the leaders of that movement pay heed to the dangers which are incident to such attacks?

The American people have been awakened by this event. They rightfully ask the leaders of labor to place a check on the irresponsibility that allowed this attack to happen.

If the union leaders are not diligent in their duties in this respect, it can but bring disfavor on their other efforts. I am hopeful that investigation will bring to light those responsible for the attack on Mr. Riesel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks several newspaper editorials concerning the attack on Mr. Riesel, and several articles which have been written by Mr. Riesel's staff, in carrying on the courageous work he started.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

#### GET THIS RAT

The cowardly acid-throwing attack early yesterday morning on labor columnist Victor Riesel occurred about 2 hours after he had broadcast a radio discussion of labor racketeering on Long Island.

Riesel also has been working with United States Attorney Paul W. Williams in his probe into rackets in various industries.

These circumstances of course do not prove that the acid-throwing was procured or inspired by some labor leader(s) who didn't like what Riesel was dishing.

The circumstances of the attack do indicate that it will be to the vital public-relations interest of every labor leader hereabout to cooperate to the hilt with the po-

lice, the FBI, the Manhattan and Federal prosecutors, and every other law-enforcement agency concerned in tracking down the guilty thug—and whoever sent him.

[From the New York Times]

#### STREET ATTACK

The cowardly and vicious acid-throwing attack yesterday on Victor Riesel a well-known commentator on labor affairs, should bring the complacent citizens of this metropolis up with a start. An outrage like this, perpetrated on the street in the very heart of the city, is gangsterism that cannot and will not be tolerated.

The thug who sidled up to Mr. Riesel and doused his face with a chemical that may cost him his sight was committing an assault not only on a law-abiding citizen but also on the free press of this city and on free labor as well. We do not know what the actual motive was for this barbaric act; but it will certainly be widely interpreted as reprisal both for what Mr. Riesel has said and written about racketeering in certain labor unions and for whatever assistance he gave or was about to give to the United States attorney in the current grand jury investigation into labor rackets. A broadcast he had made just prior to the attack dealt with racketeering in a notorious Long Island building construction union.

The search for the criminal who made the attack and for the person or persons who were behind him must be pursued with tireless diligence by the law enforcement agencies concerned. It must also have the wholehearted support of every honest labor union official; for in the last analysis the greatest damage done by an incident like this is to the good name of labor and to the cause of decent unionism.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 6, 1956]

#### OUTRAGE BY THE UNDERWORLD

The dastardly attack on Victor Riesel was a horrible thing. A civilized community composed overwhelmingly of decent, law-abiding citizens has been outraged. For what has happened here? Mr. Riesel, a newspaper columnist with a distinguished record of fighting crooks and criminals in the labor movement, was the victim of a bottle of acid flung in his face. He had just participated in a radio program which dealt forthrightly with the Union of Operating Engineers, the outfit that has been directed by such time-serving extortionists as Joey Fay and Bill DeKoning. Sr. He had been cooperating with the Federal investigation of racketeering in the garment, trucking and food industries.

It is barely possible, of course, that the acid assault which may well leave Mr. Riesel blind for life had nothing to do with such matters. But we don't believe it. United States Attorney Paul W. Williams says this was "an out-and-out threat and a black effort to intimidate witnesses." It is, then, a parallel to the recent unsuccessful attempt to exterminate Louis Saperstein, the key figure in a big union welfare-fund racket who was giving District Attorney Frank S. Hogan valuable assistance. In short, this is the voice of the underworld serving notice that the racket octopus does not wish to be disturbed in its profitable and parasitical attentions to trade unionism.

As every newspaper reader must be aware, the local air has been thick with charges and counter-charges, court actions, prosecutors' warnings and investigations, all having to do with the central subject of power politics and a considerable degree of criminal infringement on the integrity of organized labor. One way or another there must be a housecleaning—from without or within, or both. The waterfront has long been a prime example of criminal infesta-

tion, and now, as District Attorney Hogan has already pointed out, the underworld is making a determined effort to seize control of the Joint Council of Teamsters and thereby take the trucking industry as a hunting ground for tribute to the rackets.

The Riesel outrage, as we see it, states the challenge to law and order in the most direct terms. Mr. Riesel has the sympathy of everyone; the perpetrator of this shocking crime must be brought to justice. But, even more important, this deed is a challenge to all New York which demands to be acted upon with all possible force of legal and moral indignation. Let it be understood that this community will not tolerate rule by racketeers.

#### INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column is being written by Victor Riesel's staff after a dramatic bedside conference almost immediately after the injured columnist recovered from heavy sedation administered to ease the pain of the acid burns on his face and eyes.)

Victor Riesel, face scarred by acid burns, eyes puffed and painful, awoke from a merciful drugged sleep only an hour ago. His first coherent conversation was with his two staff members who have been at his bedside from the moment they were first notified of the sneak attack which may cost Riesel his sight.

The measure of this brave newspaperman is in the words he first spoke. "How are Bill Wilkens and Pete Batalias (the two leaders of the reform group fighting against labor czar Bill DeKoning of the Operating Engineers Union)—are they O. K.? Did anything happen to them? Tell them to take care."

His first thought, in his first moment of rational consciousness, was for the safety of these two working Joes whose fight for decency he supported so brilliantly in his columns for the past year.

His next words were the measure of a newsman's newsman. "Don't stop the column now. We'll discuss it each day when I'm awake. Then you two write it. Don't stop it and don't use guest columns. I can't see now, but I can still talk."

Typed or dictated, the exposures of corruption and indecency will go on. Previous columns by Riesel have been called in by several law enforcement agencies. They are being read carefully to see what Riesel may have written to provoke the acid attack. For there is general agreement now that his hard-hitting exposés were coming too close to home for comfort for certain elements.

At least three law enforcement agencies have called for all of the columns written by Victor Riesel in the last year. Their experts are poring over the many exposures contained in them—paying particular attention to situations and names pinpointed in the past 6 months.

A spokesman for one of these law groups told Riesel's staff that "We are pretty much convinced that the attack had to stem from something relatively recent that the column exposed." This same official pointed out that if the assault related to something written longer back it would have happened sooner. In addition to the columns, the texts of Riesel's recent broadcasts, in which he swung heavily at racketeering, in general, and racketeering inside labor, in particular, were also under close scrutiny for possible clues.

There is no question in the minds either of Riesel's staff members or the many law enforcement officials to whom they have spoken that the brutal attack is linked to some phase of labor racketeering laid bare by Riesel. Most of these officials have also ruled out speculation that the attack was the work of some "crank" or "amateur" working on his own.



They point out that Riesel and his escorts were carefully followed from the scene of the broadcast to the site of the actual attack. His car was carefully noted. The assailant was spotted at the precise point where the car was parked. And the acid tosser had been briefed to recognize Riesel on sight.

The preparation of the acid was a professional job, too. Most amateurs use lye or some lye solution. More often than not they toss it from the original can. This solution was highly concentrated sulfuric acid carefully carried in a special jar with a wide, open mouth. That the acid was tossed directly into Riesel's eyes in a practiced upward motion is also the mark of the "pro," they added.

Many of the columns under close scrutiny discuss mob activities with national ramifications. Others deal with lush underworld operations centered primarily in the New York area. All involve men with long police records or with associates who are known criminals.

Nor are the law agencies overlooking some of the hard-hitting columns that exposed recent Communist directives to its cadres across the country. Or the exposures of the cooperation between pro-Soviet agents and underworld representatives on the New York waterfront.

One Federal official told Riesel's staff that everyone found to be involved in any way with the activities exposed by Riesel or connected with persons involved will be carefully investigated and/or questioned. Special attention will be paid to "alibis" for the time of the attack on Riesel.

Among the columns under scrutiny, this official indicated, are those dealing with the garment and trucking rackets, waterfront and narcotics rackets, Communist activities, CP-mob tieups, perishable food industry extortion, sale of charters, sale of members of one union hood to another for a fee and terrorization of small-business men whose employees are primarily Puerto Rican.

Somewhere in these fighting columns, they believe, lies the significant clue to those behind the attack on Riesel. Who are they? Only time, wide publicity, and effective police work will tell.

#### INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column was written by Victor Riesel's staff after a bedside conference with the stricken columnist in St. Clare's Hospital.)

Skilled investigators busily checking recent columns by Victor Riesel in a search for leads to the assailant who hurled sulfuric acid into his face admitted to his staff Sunday that "we were amazed at his courage in tackling some of the situations he uncovered and appalled at the number of persons or groups who might have real desire to put him out of business."

One prober added that they were convinced that the attack, aside from attempting to halt Riesel's exposures, was aimed at so horrifying and terrifying potential witnesses before the newly empaneled grand juries digging into rackets, that the prosecutors would be unable to win convictions and might not even be able to get enough evidence for indictments.

A veteran law officer told Riesel's staff that "a beating might have scared off a few. A shooting might have scared some. But the effect of such attacks would have worn off before too long and some witnesses would still come forth. But the horror of acid in the eyes has such a permanent frightening effect that the probes may collapse."

In a column that appeared just three days before the attack, Riesel had pinpointed the nature of extortion devices in many fields, including the garment industry. He mentioned one of the devices used when an

employer balked at payoffs was to sprinkle valuable shipments of clothes with acid. Grimly enough the acid throwers in the garment field specialized in the use of sulfuric acid, the same kind used in the attempt to blind Riesel.

The day after that column appeared there was widespread reaction among the men deep in garment center crime circles. An intimate of an ex-con, described as the common denominator in a score of rackets, was overheard cursing Riesel.

He is quoted as heatedly shouting to a group around him, "Did you see what that ----- Riesel is trying to do to the garment center?"

But the easy-money boys in the garment and trucking fields are not the only ones who had cause to hate and fear Riesel.

Only last week, for the first time anywhere, Riesel exposed the shakedown techniques of racket unions in New York which concentrate on small businesses in the New York City and Long Island areas. Riesel disclosed:

"The biggest shot in the arm to smaller hoods has been the influx of non-English-speaking Puerto Ricans into big eastern cities. These poor workers rarely know what is happening because of language difficulties and because they're understandably frightened of the new land and its processes."

"They are literally bought and sold."

"The boss is forced by local unions, many of them phony, to pay dues and initiation fees for the Puerto Ricans. This money is taken out of their wages. No meetings are called. No union really exists. The boys pocket most of the money just because they happen to own a charter."

A rundown of at least 10 of such racket unions described by Riesel reveals that many of their officials have long police records for crimes ranging from larceny to assault to bookmaking to narcotics raps to attempted murder. Many of them are punks who got their sleazy start in the older gangs that infested the food and garment industries and specialized, among other things, in hurling acid on dresses, meats, and other commodities if not persons.

With the stakes that high, with the principals involved born and steeped in the crudest techniques of violence, many anti-crime experts have told Riesel's staff that they believe the fendish attack on him might well have originated in this area. Especially since the boys, emboldened by the size of the take in this area, were discussing seriously the establishment of branch offices with their comrades in crime in other large cities with heavy populations of non-English-speaking workers.

Why the concentration on Riesel's columns? Obviously because the authorities are convinced the attack stems from the mobs. Proof of this is seen in the fact that Manhattan's District Attorney Hogan assigned the case to his rackets bureau instead of one of the other departments in his office.

#### INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column is being written by Victor Riesel's staff after a conference at his bedside in St. Clare's Hospital.)

We have just left Vic Riesel's bedside. He is in excellent spirits. He joked with us. He had a million ideas about the column. His outlook and his courage are tremendous.

But we're glad he had the patches over his eyes, for we'd rather he couldn't see us sitting there next to him with tears streaming down our cheeks.

We cried at the bravery he is displaying. We cried because he was concerned about our morale and was cheering us up.

And we cried, for, even as he talked, we sat hypnotized by the horrible acid burns that cover his face—the face which, under

normal circumstances at this time of the day, he'd be stroking with his electric razor. For Vic Riesel is always on the go and invariably he races for the office in the morning without stopping to shave.

And each day, just about the time we sat with him, he plugs in his battered razor and gives himself the "once-over" while we kick around the column for the day.

Vic's face is a mass of ugly burns and red welts. His forehead is covered. Both sides of his face are burned. His lips are seared and talking is tough for him. Even the side of his nose and the inner parts of his nostrils are etched with the acid splashed across his face.

Even yet he is in pain. We know that. But some casual observer would never guess it, for not a word of complaint passes his lips.

Vic is still very concerned about the safety of Pete Batallas and Bill Wilkens, the leaders of the fight against William DeKoning, Jr., of the Operating Engineers Union. He urged us to make sure that they and their families are protected.

What he didn't know—and we didn't tell him for fear it would upset him too much—was that these two ex-GTs, now in Chicago for the union's convention, were again threatened on Monday and warned to "stay away from Riesel and the other papers, if you want to leave town alive."

Another threat warned them to "pack your bags and get out of town quick. You had a family when you left home. Get out of here fast if you want one when you get back."

If we had told him of these latest threats against these two brave boys we would not have been able to restrain him from at least getting on the phone to contact the authorities and demand immediate action.

For, sick as he is, uncertain as his future sight is at the moment, Vic is full of fight.

In less than 10 minutes of talk he outlined a series of columns he thought we ought to do in the week ahead. He was able to toss at us, with amazing accuracy, the essence of a raft of memos we had compiled about the situations he wanted us to handle in the columns.

We've been with him a long time but even we were just amazed at his vitality in the face of pain and his eagerness to get back into the swing of things again—to pick up where he left off before the sneak attack on him.

We hesitated to ask him how he felt. We were frankly afraid to raise the delicate question of whether he was in pain. Characteristically, he solved the problem for us. He began to tell us how it felt.

"When this punk first threw the acid on me," he said, "I thought he had tossed a glass of water at me. There was no immediate sensation except wetness. It took perhaps 2 or 3 minutes for me to realize, when the stinging sensations began that it might have been acid."

"Even then the full horror of it didn't quite sink in for perhaps another minute or two. And then it hit me like a ton of bricks. I guess I conked out although I was conscious. I knew what was happening around me. I heard myself talking and knew I was talking but if you ask me now what I said, I couldn't tell you for sure. They tell me I made certain statements. Maybe so. But I don't remember them. I was in a numbed shock. All I could think of was my eyes."

"I think I called out Evelyn's name (his wife) and the kids' names. I'm not sure. I do know that I was thinking to myself 'what will happen to them if I do go blind?' and then everything is a real blur until early Friday morning."

"Now I lie here and thank God that at least so far I can see faces and recognize them. Maybe that means I'll keep my sight. I don't know. I like to think so. I'd be kid-

ding you and myself if I said that the prospect doesn't frighten me. But whether I see fully again—or at all—I'll go back to the column, and if they think they had cause to blind me before now, they'll have a dozen more reasons to kill me when I get back to the column."

When he finished, we left—still crying. This much we knew—Inside Labor always covered the biggest labor stories of the day. And we're doing just that now, for the biggest labor story of the day is that brave little guy, racked with pain on his hospital bed—Vic Riesel.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

The Hall Syndicate and the New York Mirror are offering a \$10,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the acid throwing assailant who attacked labor columnist Victor Riesel early this morning (April 5).

The announcement was made by Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the Mirror, and Robert M. Hall, president of the Hall Syndicate, which distributes Riesel's column.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DESIGNATION OF LOCK AND DAM NO. 17 ON THE BLACK WARRIOR RIVER, ALA., AS THE JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD LOCK AND DAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1749, Senate bill 2424.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2424) to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to designate lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Alabama, as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam, in honor of our late beloved colleague, Senator Bankhead.

The site of lock and dam No. 17 is on the Black Warrior River 379 miles upstream from Mobile, Ala. It was authorized in 1907, and opened to traffic in 1915. The lock has a double lift, the total lift being 72 feet.

It is fitting and proper that this lock and dam bear the name of John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam in honor of the great statesman from Alabama who so ably served his State and the Nation in the United States Senate from 1931 to 1946.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in honor of the late Senator John Hollis Bankhead, and in recognition of his outstanding service in securing the improvement of the Black Warrior River, Ala., lock and dam No. 17 on such river shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam, and shall be dedicated to his memory as a monument to his distinguished public service. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lock and dam is designated or referred to as lock and dam No. 17 shall be held and considered to refer to such lock and dam under and by the name of the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam.

#### TOLLS ON THE MANETTE BRIDGE IN BREMERTON, WASH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1750, Senate bill 2712.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2712) to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment on page 2, line 20, after the word "the", to strike out "Manette Bridge" and insert "bridges", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained in the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to W. E. Buell, of Seattle, Wash., to construct a bridge across Port Washington Narrows within the city of Bremerton in the State of Washington," approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 744), authority is hereby granted to the Washington Toll Bridge Authority as an agency of the State of Washington to fix and charge tolls over the bridge constructed pursuant to such act (hereinafter referred to as the "Manette Bridge").

Sec. 2. The rates of the tolls authorized by the first section of this act shall be so adjusted that the amounts collected from the tolls on the Manette Bridge together with the amounts collected from the tolls imposed on not more than one additional bridge hereafter to be constructed by such Authority adjacent to the Manette Bridge and across Port Washington Narrows from within the city of Bremerton, Wash., will provide (a) a fund sufficient to pay the cost of the maintenance and operation of both such bridges, and (b) a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of reconstructing and improving the Manette Bridge and of constructing such additional bridge and the approaches thereto, including interest and financing costs, within a period of not more than 30 years after the date such reconstruction, or construction and improvement is commenced, whichever first occurs. After there has been collected from such tolls an

amount sufficient to provide such funds, the bridges shall be maintained and operated free of tolls.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the passage of the bill the statement of purpose of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 2712 is to authorize the Washington Toll Bridge Authority, as an agency of the State of Washington, to fix and charge tolls on the existing Manette Bridge across Port Washington Narrows at Bremerton, Wash., notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained in the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 744). Tolls would be collected on the Manette Bridge, and not more than one additional bridge hereafter to be constructed by such authority adjacent to the Manette Bridge, to provide a fund sufficient to pay the cost of the maintenance and operation of both such bridges, and provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of reconstructing and improving the Manette Bridge and of constructing such additional bridge and the approaches thereto, including interest and financing costs, within a period of not more than 30 years after such reconstruction or construction and improvement is commenced. After amortization, both bridges would be maintained and operated free of tolls.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RECONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT OR NEAR ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1751, Senate bill 2091.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2091) authorizing reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 2, line 15, after the word "bridge", to insert a colon and "Provided, That such approaches shall include only those necessary portions of streets, avenues, and boulevards which are directly connected with the bridge, or which are located immediately adjacent thereto, and whose principal use is to provide access to the bridge"; and on page 3, at the beginning of line 17, to insert "free of tolls", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the city of Rock Island, Ill., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge



across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill., and to a place at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa," approved March 18, 1938, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The city of Rock Island, Ill., or any State or political subdivision thereof which may have acquired the bridge constructed pursuant to the subsection (a) of this section, is hereby authorized, subject to the prior approval of the plans by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, to reconstruct and enlarge such bridge and to reconstruct, enlarge, and extend the approaches to such bridge, including, but not limiting the generality of the foregoing, the altering, widening, laying out, opening, or constructing of any streets, avenues, or boulevards within or without any municipality deemed necessary by said city, or any State, public agency, or political subdivision that may take over or acquire said bridge in order to provide adequate traffic regulations and approach or approaches to the said bridge: *Provided*, That such approaches shall include only those necessary portions of streets, avenues, and boulevards which are directly connected with the bridge, or which are located immediately adjacent thereto, and whose principal use is to provide access to the bridge."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such act of March 18, 1938, is amended by inserting "(including reconstructing, enlarging, and extending such bridge and its approaches)" after "and its approaches."

Sec. 3. Section 4 of such act of March 18, 1938, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches (including the reasonable cost of reconstructing, enlarging, and extending such bridge and its approaches) under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion of the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of such bridge and its approaches as provided in subsection (b) of the first section of this act. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls in accordance with such arrangement as may be agreed upon by the city of Rock Island, Ill., or its assigns, and the State highway departments or other appropriate agencies of the States of Iowa and Illinois. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; the expenditures for reconstructing, enlarging, and extending the same; and all of the daily tolls collected shall be available for the information of all persons interested."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 2091 is to amend the act approved March 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 110), which authorized the city of Rock Island, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, by authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of said bridge and its approaches, including the al-

tering, widening, laying out, opening, or construction of streets to provide adequate approaches to the bridge; to provide for adjustment or tolls to cover the cost of such reconstruction work within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of its completion; and upon amortization of the proposed improvements to maintain and operate the bridge free of tolls.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE BETWEEN FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION IN KANSAS AND PLATTE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1752, Senate bill 2092.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2092) transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas, and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 2, line 6, after the word "bridge", to strike out "if and when" and insert "as"; and in line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "Government-owned", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to transfer back to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., connecting the military reservation with the lands belonging to the Department of Justice in Platte County, Mo.

Sec. 2. The provisions in the Second Deficiency Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 687) requiring that said bridge shall be open to use by the public under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Attorney General is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. The Department of the Army is authorized to remove the said bridge as it constitutes an unreasonable obstruction to navigation and such appropriation is hereby authorized as may be necessary for its removal and the relocation of the Government-owned utilities now carried by said bridge serving the lands belonging to the Department of Justice in Platte County, Mo.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to

transfer back to the Department of the Army jurisdiction over the existing bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., which connects the military reservation with lands of the Department of Justice; repeal a proviso of the Second Deficiency Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 687), requiring the bridge to be open to public use; and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to remove said bridge and relocate Government-owned utilities now carried by the bridge, including authorization of appropriation of necessary funds for such work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### REVISIONS IN THE GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS IN FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1753, Senate bill 3272.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorizations for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to allot not to exceed \$15 million in any 1 fiscal year for construction of flood-control projects not specifically authorized by law, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is warranted. Such allotment would be subject to the following conditions: (1) That not more than \$500,000 shall be allotted to a single project during any one fiscal year, (2) that the provisions of local cooperation of section 3 of the 1936 Flood Control Act, as amended, shall apply, (3) that State and local concurrence shall be obtained for each project prior to commencing construction, and (4) that the work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to additional improvements. The Secretary would be required to report to the Senate and House Committees on Public Works on any project costing over \$150,000, 30 days before starting construction.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be inserted the testimony of General Fleming, New England Chief, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, because of its educational value in connection with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator's request, and I appreciate his observation.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BUSH. General, I think rather than run through this, we should submit this to the Chief of Engineers' office, General Itschner, and let them supply this information. This has to be carefully worked out. He can supply the answers to this list of questions when he comes down next Thursday. Wouldn't that save time?

General FLEMING. I think so.

Senator BUSH. General, I have no questions to ask you. You are of course familiar with the situation up there, much more so than anybody I could think of. So if you would care to express yourself in your own way as to your views on this measure, you may do so.

General FLEMING. I would like to start off, Senator, by saying that I am here solely to discuss the specific problem as concerns New England. Representatives of the Chief of Engineers, my superiors, General Itschner and others, will testify as far as the Chief of Engineers is concerned on the national aspects of this proposed bill. So my comments will be entirely on the situation as involves my area in New England.

My comments also, as I make them, will be colored by the fact as I see the problem in New England. I plead guilty to the fact that I do not know what the situation is in the rest of the country. But unfortunately, however, I am overly familiar with the flood situation and the particular critical problem which faces the New England States at this particular time. Therefore as I give my story I probably cannot but help be colored a little bit by my intimacy with that particular problem.

I think we have a situation in New England which, when the flood control legislation was passed by the Congress, throughout the years, was never contemplated. On public works projects the procedure imposed by Congress has included a very thorough engineering analysis which, in addition to figuring out the feasible thing from an engineering standpoint, also went into hydrological factors, economic factors, and things like that, in attempt to forecast what might happen. You needed that forecast in order to design protective works.

The situation we now have in New England is that nature has done most of that preliminary work for us. The floods in August were about 3 to 3½ or 4 times the previous maximum floods of record. There are scars in the valleys of New England now, particularly in the Farmington River in Connecticut, the Naugatuck River in Connecticut, the Blackstone, which flows through Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the Thames River Basin which originates in Massachusetts and flows into Connecticut, and in certain tributaries of the Connecticut River in Massachusetts, largely the Westfield and Chicopee, there are scars which the floodwaters have carved on the landscape. We have there visible and ready to read the engineering factors which could be obtained only after very laborious computations in the past.

The Congress has rightfully prescribed a procedure for public works projects, whereby a survey report is directed, a report is rendered to the committee which authorizes us to make the report, through the Bureau of the Budget and then is considered by the committee and finally authorized by both Houses of Congress. I think in my own opinion that that administrative detail and routine was prescribed by the Congress to insure that no hasty, ill-advised work was done. In order to have that insurance it imposed a time delay, in the process of get-

ting a project written up in acceptable form and then the time necessary to have it considered by the entire Congress. The point I am trying to make is that nature in New England in this last flood has actually shown us in many cases what should be done.

I think that we are now up against a situation where we are fighting time. As a result of the work under Public Law 875, and I received very liberal instructions in interpreting that law, we have done on various streams in New England work which in normal times we would have done under a permanent flood-control project. These were such things as channel clearance and actually increasing capacities at various places where bridges had gone out. We couldn't leave the wrecked bridge and rubble in, so we widened the channel and improved the hydraulic characteristics. In doing that we have taken the material that we have excavated out of the streams and piled it at the nearest place we could. We have piled it along the stream banks in what are actually embryo dikes. They are a start toward permanent dikes. We did this very hurriedly. We were not able to make detailed analyses of the soil mechanics of the earth we put into those dikes. We weren't always able, even under the most liberal interpretation of Public Law 875, to convert those things into permanent works. The result is that now in several of the communities in New England, we have these embryo dikes which have not been faced on the outside with riprap or stone. In many cases they aren't tied back into high ground because of the existence of a road at a different grade from the top of the dike. We had no authority to change any elevations in roads, nor do we have any authority if the road has to stay in the same place, to construct a permanent stop log structure which could be used as a block through that gap.

A typical project, typical situation, which we have right now is, for example, the city of Torrington, Conn. Even after the expedited program of authorized flood-control projects is constructed, Torrington will still be vulnerable because it is upstream from the only presently authorized project on the Naugatuck River. Torrington now has these dikes, embryo dikes—I would like to emphasize that—it has had certain channels cleared and widened, it has had bends enlarged where bridges formerly constricted the stream, and various things of that sort. If we have a recurrence in Torrington, not of the high water of last August, but of, say, water which would approximate the flows of the previous flood of record of 1948 in the Naugatuck Valley, or the storm which we had in October following the August storm which was almost 30 percent greater than the previous flood of record, we would lose a large part of the temporary work which has already been done because it does not have the strength built into it to withstand ordinary high water.

The States are participating in this program, or are prepared to participate in it. The State of Massachusetts has an appropriation, I believe, of \$5 million for flood-control work, and you might say, drainage work inside of communities affected by the last flood, which they are going to use to expand any efforts the Federal Government makes. Connecticut has already made available, with a smaller problem due only to the smaller size of Connecticut compared to Massachusetts, the sum of \$1 million.

Rhode Island has appropriated similar sums. I don't know exactly how much it now has available, for State participation in this. The city of Torrington, if I may go back to use that illustration, has already bonded itself to the tune of about \$450,000 just so it can buy properties, buy rights-of-way and things like that, to give us the right to go in and make these temporary improvements.

I don't think anywhere in New England is there a lack of local participation. There

is right now a delay being encountered because the local authorities in the three States affected by the floods don't know what the Federal Government is going to do. Due to the time lag in getting a project through the study phase and through the authorization phase, it will be some time before we can tell them what the Federal Government is planning to do.

Senator BUSH. Is it not true that the action that this bill would permit are among the uncertain factors, too?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSH. Incidentally, and parenthetical to your remarks, have you any estimate as to how much of the \$15 million annually authorized under S. 3272 might be needed in New England immediately?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. We figure that, assuming the bill passes, assuming the appropriation is made, we estimate—this may be a liberal estimate again because I am optimistic in this thing—we estimate that there would be about eight projects in the category that we could complete in fiscal year 1957.

In other words, between the first of July of this year and June 30 of 1957, there are about 8 of these projects which would cost somewhere around the neighborhood of \$3.2 million.

Senator BUSH. An average of about \$400,000 per project?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSH. Go ahead. I didn't want to break your train of thought.

General FLEMING. With the States having the money appropriated and available, they are up against the situation of not knowing what the Federal Government will do in the future.

Under the present procedure, which imposes this time of authorization, it is going to be some time, frankly, in my opinion, before we can tell them what authorized projects there are going to be. I think that they are vulnerable. The States are desperately anxious to get started. We have done some work which, with every day that passes, will bring us closer to the next high-water period. With every day that passes that work is going to be vulnerable and we are apt to lose it for the lack of some additional measures which we weren't able to do under Public Law 875.

The procedure, of course, sir, imposed by the Congress, now has under section 212 of the flood control law the authority for the Chief of Engineers to authorize—not to authorize projects, but Congress delegated to him the power to approve projects where the total cost is about \$150,000 and the money can be spent in 1 fiscal year. I believe that last year about \$800,000 was appropriated for that for the country as a whole.

Senator BUSH. There is a limit there.

General FLEMING. There is a limit of \$150,000 for each project.

Senator BUSH. And there is an overall limit?

General FLEMING. There is an overall limit. It is the appropriations which they make each year. Last year it was in the neighborhood of \$800,000.

The problem in New England, sir, is this: The projects we have, the work we did under Public Law 785, in various communities is so extensive that where I said there were 8 that could be done—averaging about \$400,000, depending on the limit Congress puts on it—if the limit were held at \$150,000 there are probably only 3 that could be done. Unless, which Congress wouldn't permit, we could pyramid one on top of the other. That would be a subterfuge and I don't believe it should be done.

Senator BUSH. So you are faced with a real limitation, then, unless something is done right away in the way of legislation to permit you to go ahead.

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. I think there is a very great potential danger of losing a



lot of work which has already been done. These nine places that I am talking about are locations where flood threat would not be decreased by the construction of any now authorized flood-control work, because they are located upstream from reservoirs.

Senator BUSH. Is it possible for you to give us the names of the nine locations that you do have in mind? Have you them in mind so you can give them for the record now?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. I would like to submit that for the record later.

Senator BUSH. We will be glad to have that.

General FLEMING. I can give you 2 or 4 illustrations now. Torrington, Conn. is obviously one situation. New Hartford, Conn., and another is the extension of the presently authorized project through Woonsocket, R. I. There is one up around the town of Palmer in Massachusetts.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

"The nine locations previously referred to are as follows: Naugatuck, Conn.; Seymour, Conn.; Derby, Conn.; Union City, Conn.; West Branch, Naugatuck River, Conn.; East Branch, Naugatuck River, Conn.; Torrington, Conn.; New Hartford, Conn.; and Ware, Mass.

Senator BUSH. Wouldn't a lot of work going on in the Naugatuck River, below Waterbury, where those temporary dikes are just thrown up, would they be eligible for work under this bill?

General FLEMING. I would hope that they would be, sir.

Senator BUSH. Permanent work?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. Because the Thomaston Dam in the Naugatuck Valley controls roughly about 31 percent of the basin. If we had had—leaving the August flood out of consideration and just talking about the October flood in the Naugatuck Valley—even had Thomaston Reservoir been operating in the October flood, there still would have been some very serious damage in the towns of Naugatuck and Ansonia.

We have thrown up these temporary dikes in those two communities. Additional protection is going to be required in Ansonia and Naugatuck in addition to the protection of Thomaston Reservoir.

For example, I have the figures here. At the city of Naugatuck in October the flow, assuming the Thomaston Dam had been built, would have been 22,500 second-feet. It actually reached about 35,000 second-feet. So the effect of Thomaston, downriver as far as Naugatuck, really knocks off about one-third of October flood. The previous flood at Naugatuck was 28,500 second-feet in 1948. The point I make is that even with the recurrence of the October flood, and Thomaston Reservoir having been built, Naugatuck would still get almost as much water as it got in the previous flood or record in 1948. So I think at Naugatuck and Ansonia both, additional protection will eventually be required. Some work has already been done at both of those places under Public Law 875 which could be converted into a permanent improvement.

Senator BUSH. That is what I had in mind. General, is that all that you have to observe this morning?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. I will answer any questions that you have.

Senator BUSH. The committee thanks you for coming down here to testify. As I have said many times before, New England certainly owes you a very great debt of gratitude for your constant and faithful interest in our problems during the past year. We don't know sometimes what we would have done without you.

General FLEMING. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared with reference to Senate bill 3272 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR KUCHEL

The bill S. 3272, providing general authorization for small flood-control projects, will plug a serious hole in the system of administrative and legislative dikes by which the Congress and the Federal Government have attempted to protect the people of the United States, their land, homes, livestock, transportation, and utility systems, and other possessions against the rampages of nature.

I am happy to join as cosponsor of this measure because tragic happenings in my own State of California, in New England, in the Middle Atlantic region, and other sections of the country have demonstrated an urgent need for a law which will make it possible in building flood-prevention works to keep pace with the growth of our Nation and the development of various areas where in past years heavy rains and snowmelt could run harmlessly to the sea without endangering life and property.

All of us on this committee are gravely concerned about the importance of pressing forward as rapidly as finances, manpower, and planning allow with the comprehensive system of flood-control projects which have been authorized at previous sessions of Congress. We also are thoroughly aware that the presently authorized works will not extend protection to all communities and sections which are entitled to the benefits of such projects. At the same time, we realize that the amount of imagination and foresight will enable either Congress or the administrative agencies of the Government, particularly the Army Corps of Engineers, to anticipate conditions which may make additional projects both desirable and economically feasible.

During recent history, it has been customary for Congress every few years to hold long hearings and draft a bulky omnibus bill authorizing a number of projects which it is intended will be built over a period of following years. Those projects are approved on the strength of evidence about the threat of danger to different areas measured by a yardstick of possible loss in terms of life and dollars which is applied against the estimated cost of protective works.

The writing and enactment of such a bill is laborious and a time-consuming process. Inevitably many proposed projects are left on the shelf because time did not permit consideration of the need and the merit.

The omnibus bills, such as those of 1936, 1944, 1946, 1950, and 1954, were designed to provide protection against conditions as they existed at those particular times. They did not—because they could not—take into consideration the possible expansion of cities in stream valleys, the development of farms in lands made possible of cultivation by irrigation and reclamation projects, the construction of new highways and relocation of old ones over more direct routes, and the vagaries of weather which every so often seems to be following a pattern different than in the past.

The capital investments which the Congress in the past 20 years has authorized—which exceed \$3,500 million not including the vast lower Mississippi program—have paid big dividends and justified the expenditure. Yet, the growth and development of our Nation has proceeded faster than it is possible for Congress to authorize, and the Federal Government to obtain money with which to build, additional projects that are sorely needed.

The reason why legislation such as S. 3272 is warranted can be illustrated by references to conditions in my own State of California. The ambitious flood-control program for Los Angeles County has had to be modified and

revised repeatedly because of the way population has jumped and suburban areas have come into being. The completion of the great Central Valley project has opened up vast acreages which formerly could not be cultivated because of insufficient or unstable water supplies. As people have spread into the foothills of the mountains of southern California and onto the lands in the Central Valley they have occupied tracts of land which are susceptible to flooding whenever extraordinary rains and thaws occur. In many instances the threat to these more recently settled places comes from small streams and isolated canyons which are not parts of any major river systems or in a recognized drainage basin.

If the Army engineers in the past have had the authority to plan, engineer, and build projects of the sort contemplated in S. 3272 very probably there already would be in existence a number of small projects—dikes, retarding dams, and debris basins—which would safeguard these newly created residential communities and lately developed farming areas against just such unforeseen and uncontrollable natural catastrophes as occurred in California during the past winter.

This bill is sound. It would give flexibility to the continuing effort to protect the people of our Nation against floods. The discretionary authority we provide to construct without the necessity of getting specific authorization projects costing not over \$500,000, and which are complete entities in themselves will enable the Army engineers to initiate works as new demands arise.

Any chances that this power would be misused to launch work which might lead to continuing expenditures and that the bill would provide a foot-in-the-door approach toward big commitments to make future appropriations are offset by the limitations that projects costing between \$150,000 and \$500,000 must be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Committees of Congress and by the ceiling of \$15 million on the outlay in any fiscal year. The requirements of local participation, involving substantial contributions by the people who would benefit, insure that no boondoggles could be undertaken.

During the past 3 years major floods have occurred in 18 different States. In a number of the affected areas no flood-control projects ever were authorized, presumably because the possible threat was not considered grave enough to warrant including authorization in one of the omnibus bills that have been enacted in the past two decades or the proposed projects were deemed too small for serious consideration. Experience has shown, however, that those affected areas cannot be ignored, and when disaster strikes once it easily can hit again. The Army engineers under our legislation could swing into action to provide future protection against a repetition of heavy damage in such sections of our Nation.

This legislation would be a logical supplement to present statutes and in all probability a moneysaving step in the long run. Congress has authorized the Army engineers, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and other agencies to engage in emergency rescue and rehabilitation work, and it has provided Federal credit through the Small Business Administration for rebuilding homes and farms and businesses. It seems only good sense to give the Army engineers this kind of discretionary power to build small projects which could avert disasters and thus minimize the need for spending Federal funds to fight floods and get people back on their feet.

This legislation would apply the time-tested principle that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3272) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed \$15 million for any 1 fiscal year for the construction of flood control projects not specifically authorized by law when, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is warranted, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) Not more than \$500,000 shall be allotted for this purpose for any single project for expenditure during any 1 fiscal year;

"(2) The provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply;

"(3) Concurrence shall be obtained from the affected State or political subdivision, or both, prior to the commencement of construction of each proposed project; and

"(4) The work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

"(b) (1) Before work is initiated under this section on any flood control project or other flood protective measure which the Secretary of the Army estimates will cost in excess of \$150,000 for any 1 fiscal year, he shall submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives a report outlining the proposed plan of protection together with an analysis of the justification therefor. The report shall be delivered to both committees on the same day and while each House is in session. No work shall be initiated on any project or other measure with respect to which such a report is made until the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the report is transmitted to the committees.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(B) in the computation of the 30-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain."

#### AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1777, Senate bill 2854.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2854) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment after line 5, to strike out:

Sec. 2. Section 217 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "\$4,000,-

000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,060,000,000."

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 203 (h) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "\$7,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have a brief explanation of the bill before it is acted upon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill would amend section 203 (h) of the National Housing Act, as amended, which authorizes the FHA to insure a mortgage for an individual whose home, regardless of whether he owned or rented, was damaged or destroyed by disaster. Under present law, the FHA can insure such a mortgage up to 100 percent of the appraised value of the property and up to \$7,000. This bill would increase the dollar limit from \$7,000 to \$12,000.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to say that the floods of last year show that \$7,000 was completely unrealistic. There is no objection to the figure of \$12,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AUTHORITY TO STOCKPILE TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1778, Senate bill 2855.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2855) to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enactment clause and insert:

That the Public Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for emergency production and delivery of housing and equipment in the event of a major disaster as defined in section 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended. Such housing and equipment may be made available to local public agencies, the American Red Cross, or other nonprofit relief organi-

zations, without charge, to provide shelter for victims of any such disaster. The Commissioner is also authorized and directed to prepare procedures for emergency mobilization of local services and property to provide emergency shelter including the preparation of sites for emergency dwellings.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law except provisions enacted hereafter which refer specifically to this act, the Commissioner is authorized to use for the purposes of this act not to exceed \$5 million of funds made available by section 20 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. All receipts of the Public Housing Administration under this act and any reimbursements to the Administration pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, shall be applied to repayment of the note or notes of the Public Housing Administration executed and delivered in connection with funds obtained pursuant to said section 20, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall credit as a payment upon such note or notes an amount equal to the amount certified by the Commissioner as having been expended under this act and which the Administration has not repaid out of such receipts or reimbursements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is there any estimate of the cost involved? Does the bill contemplate assembling housing, tents—or what?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my understanding is that it authorizes not to exceed \$5 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, as amended, (1) provides authority for the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for emergency production and delivery of housing and equipment into a location declared by the President to be a major disaster area, and (2) authorizes the Commissioner to use \$5 million of funds which he can borrow from the Treasury under section 20 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (which makes loan funds available for low-rent public housing) with which to purchase the emergency housing and equipment.

Annually, in one form or another, the Nation is subjected to the violent forces of nature which cause millions of dollars of damage to property and untold misery, exposure, and death to many of the Nation's families. During 1955 alone, the United States suffered two of the worst flood disasters recorded in our history. From time to time the Congress, taking into consideration the needs of the victims of these disasters, immediately following the devastation, has enacted legislation to provide funds and other assistance for these victims.

In numerous instances, however, the assistance provided does not reach the victim at the time the need is the greatest. This is especially true of housing. Existing law authorizes the various Federal housing agencies to provide temporary or emergency housing in disaster areas. However, the difficulties of locating and preparing sites and locating, moving, and erecting housing in the disaster areas are very time consuming.

The bill, as amended, is designed to provide a flexible plan under which housing can be made available to disaster victims as early as possible after the need occurs. The agency contemplates that under the authority granted by this bill, contracts could be entered into on a standby or emergency basis



for emergency production and delivery of approximately 2,000 movable housing units, consisting of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom trailers, which would be available for occupancy in the disaster area within a minimum period of time after the President declares the area to be a disaster area.

The bill authorizes the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration to use up to \$5 million of funds now available for the low-rent public housing program. The Public Housing Administration would be required to repay the Treasury from receipts under the bill, if any, and reimbursements received pursuant to the provisions of the disaster assistance act (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950). The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to forgive the difference between such receipts and reimbursements, and the amount expended by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Housing to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for housing to provide shelter for disaster victims, and for other purposes."

#### RENT-FREE ACCOMMODATIONS IN LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1779, Senate bill 2859.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2859) to provide rent-free accommodations in low-rent housing projects for disaster victims.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title II of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended, is hereby amended by striking the last sentence of section 204 thereof and substituting the following therefor: "During the period when the President determines that in any locality there is an acute need for housing to assure the availability of dwellings for persons engaged in national defense activities or for victims of a major disaster (as defined in sec. 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended), dwellings in a low-rent project developed, assisted, or operated in said locality pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which are devoted to the purposes of providing housing for such persons or victims shall not be subject to any of the eligibility or preference provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and during such period such projects shall be deemed projects of a low-rent character for the purpose of any

of the applicable provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That the Authority shall not require any public housing agency to obtain any advance guaranty of rent or determination as to the rent-paying ability of a disaster victim as a condition of admission to such a project."

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to contract with public housing agencies for advance payment or reimbursement for the furnishing of housing to victims of a major disaster as defined in section 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, including the furnishing of such housing free of charge to needy disaster victims during the period covered by the determination of the President under section 204 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676).

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law except provisions enacted hereafter which refer specifically to this act, the Commissioner is authorized to use for the purpose of this act not to exceed \$500,000 of funds made available by section 20 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. Any reimbursements to the Public Housing Administration pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, shall be applied to repayment of the note or notes of the Administration executed and delivered in connection with funds obtained pursuant to the said section 20, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall credit as a payment upon such note or notes an amount equal to the amount certified by the Commissioner as having been expended under this act and which the Administration has not repaid out of such reimbursements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement with reference to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill amends title II of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended, to permit victims of a major disaster, as declared by the President, as well as persons engaged in national-defense activities, to be considered for accommodations in low-rent public housing projects without respect to (a) any of the eligibility or preference provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and (b) any advance guaranty of rent or determination as to the rent-paying ability of a disaster victim as a condition of admission to such project.

The bill further authorizes the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts with local agencies for advance payment or reimbursement for low-rent housing furnished to disaster victims. An expenditure not to exceed \$500,000 from funds made available to the agency for low-rent public housing is authorized for this purpose. Such housing may be furnished rent-free to disaster victims during the disaster period as determined by the President.

Under the present eligibility or preference provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, disaster victims may be precluded from obtaining shelter in low-rent housing projects, even though vacancies may exist in such projects. This bill suspends the eligibility or preference provisions of that act in order that low-rent housing projects may be occupied by disaster victims.

In addition, a disaster victim would be permitted to occupy a low-rent housing unit without any advance guaranty of rent or determination as to his rent-paying ability as a condition of admission to such project.

The bill would also permit the Federal Government to bear the expense of the emergency shelter furnished to needy victims of disaster in such low-rent housing projects. To meet the expense of providing rent-free accommodations, the Commissioner of PHA is authorized to use up to \$500,000 of the funds now available for the low-rent public housing program. The Public Housing Administrator would be required to repay the Treasury from receipts under the bill, if any, and reimbursements received pursuant to the provisions of the disaster assistance act (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950). The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to forgive the difference between such receipts and reimbursements, and the amount expended by PHA for the purpose of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATIVE TO COUNSEL EMPLOYED BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1754, Senate Joint Resolution 160.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas, to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under Senate Resolution 219 a special committee was created by this body to investigate lobbying, campaign contributions, and other related activities. The committee, appointed under that resolution, will expire on January 31 next; and in undertaking to select a chief counsel for the committee, one who is competent to fill that responsibility, we were confronted with the problem of the conflict of interest statute which would prohibit the attorney who accepted this employment from handling any matters against the Federal Government within 2 years after his employment.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to provide for the temporary employment of counsel. This assignment will be temporary. This is not a position which will be permanent; it is not a position in which one would seek permanent em-

ployment. Because the position will be temporary, in order to obtain the quality of counsel which the committee thinks it should have to meet its heavy responsibilities, the committee is asking that, with reference to the appointment of the chief counsel of the special committee, the conflict of interest statute be suspended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That service or employment of the person first duly appointed as counsel for the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 22, 1956, shall not constitute service or employment subjecting such person to the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, United States Code, or to the provisions of any other law of the United States imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

#### PROCUREMENT OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1776, H. R. 9428.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill undertakes to deal with one of the most serious problems affecting the armed services of the country today. The purpose of the bill, known as the Medical and Dental Officer Career Incentive Act, is to reverse the alarming rate of losses among career medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces, and to attempt to induce a greater number of these officers to volunteer for a military career.

The question might be raised—and it is one which is worthy of consideration—why medical and dental officers should be singled out of all the various categories of officers in the armed services for substantially increased compensation. There is a very simple answer to the question. We have called to the colors approximately 3 million young Americans. Every Member of Congress has a direct responsibility to make certain that they and their dependents are afforded

medical care; and such a measure as this is absolutely necessary in order to meet the problem of securing adequate medical and dental aid for the men in the armed services and their dependents.

It so happens that the medical and dental officers, more than any other military group, are affected by conditions in the civilian medical and dental economy. This country does not have military medical schools. For their source of graduates in medicine and dentistry, therefore, the military services are dependent on the limited output of our civilian medical schools. Moreover, the practice of medicine and dentistry is basically no different in military life than it is in civilian life, with the result that it is no great problem for a medical officer to resign and make the transition to civilian practice.

The increased pay for career officers under the bill, which ranges from about \$50 to \$200 a month, attempts to make the military compensation more competitive with that of civilian doctors and dentists of similar experience, and thereby to attract the minimum number of officers needed for the career medical and dental corps of the armed services.

In the past 2 fiscal years, the military services have lost about 25 percent of their regular medical personnel, the number being about 1,000 medical officers. Of this number, 808 resigned from the service, and the remainder were lost because of death or retirement. During the period while we were losing 808 medical officers, only 350 new officers were taken into the regular corps; and experience indicates that a large portion of this number will resign their commissions after completing their obligated service.

In the Army during the past 2 fiscal years, of those eligible to resign, the following percentages of career medical officers have resigned: 75 percent of the captains, 66 percent of the majors, 24 percent of the lieutenant colonels, and even 2 percent of the colonels.

Senators are familiar with the necessity which drove Congress to enact a draft bill for medical officers. Since the enactment of that bill in 1950, the Department of Defense has depended on the doctor-draft legislation for two-thirds of its medical officers. Of about 10,000 medical officers on duty in the Department of Defense at present, only about 3,300 are career personnel. The pool of older physicians not otherwise liable under the regular Draft Act will be substantially exhausted by the time the doctor draft act expires on July 1, 1957. We are, therefore, driven to the enactment of legislation of this nature in order to increase the size of the career medical corps.

The Department of Defense has expressed the hope that as a result of the incentives provided in the bill, the size of the Medical Corps will be increased from one-third to two-thirds of the total requirement. It is certainly noteworthy that if an additional 3,000 career officers could be procured on a career basis as a result of the bill, the Department of Defense could avoid the drafting of 12,000 doctors over the next years.

The Department of Defense has conducted an extensive study to determine the reasons why the military services are failing to attract medical officers into the career branch of the medical-dental corps. It was the Department's finding that the principal reason was the disparity between military compensation and the compensation received by civilian physicians having comparable experience. The committee was advised that the average civilian physician who has completed 10 years of practice receives a net income, after office expenses, of approximately \$16,500 a year. The average medical officer who is out of medical school 10 years, probably will be a major or a lieutenant commander. His total compensation, including all allowances and the special pay of \$100 a month, is \$8,640 a year.

The compensation of medical officers in the armed services also compares unfavorably with that of the civilians employed in the Federal civil service and the Veterans' Administration. A physician having 10 years of civilian practice is eligible for a civil-service appointment in grade GS-15 with an annual compensation of \$12,690. In the case of the Veterans' Administration, the beginning salaries may be even higher, if the physician is a board-certified specialist.

The committee in its study of the problem realized that other factors are involved in the lack of interest in a military career, such as frequent reassignments, inadequate housing, or a general dislike for military life.

The Department of Defense assured the committee that every possible administrative action was being taken to meet these complaints.

It might be noted with regard to the assignment problem that the average medical officer can expect to be reassigned about twice as often as career officers in other fields. This condition exists because of the tremendous turnover resulting from the doctor draft, which requires only 2 years of service, and from the resignation rate of officers from the medical services. Most of the regular medical officers can expect reassignment every 2 years, and it is not at all unusual for them to be reassigned once every year.

There are also certain inherent responsibilities which may make the military medical services comparatively unattractive as a medical career. The military services, in order to provide medical service for about 3 million members, maintain throughout the world a total of about 2,000 medical units. Many of these stations are in remote and undesirable locations. We must bear in mind that one-third of all United States military personnel are stationed either overseas or on the seas. Medical care for almost 400,000 dependents overseas can be provided only by military doctors. The duty assignments and the long working hours involved in serving in many of these locations make a military career as a medical officer unattractive when compared with that of a civilian physician. It might also be noted that medical officers stationed overseas, in addition to their other duties, have the



obligation of caring for many civilian employees of the United States Government who are assigned to those areas.

The experience of the departments with respect to procurement and retention of dental officers is similar to that regarding medical officers.

#### MAJOR FEATURES

Mr. President, in order to accomplish its purpose, H. R. 9428 contains three distinct features:

First, it authorizes for medical and dental officers a 1-year increase in constructive service for permanent promotion seniority purposes. This service is increased from 4 to 5 years for physicians who have completed internships, and from 3 to 4 years for dentists. This increase would serve to recognize the required period which the physicians and dentists must spend in professional training after leaving undergraduate school.

Second, this same medical educational period up to 5 years would be credited for pay longevity purposes—5 years for the medical officers who completed internships and 4 years for dental officers. This provision will place them on the same longevity basis as their line officer contemporaries who entered military service at the same time as physicians entered medical school. The average increase under this provision is about \$50 per month, with a maximum of \$85 per month. The additional annual cost of the pay credit will be \$9,577,000.

The last feature of this bill authorizes an increase in the special pay of physicians and dentists based on length of active service as a medical or dental officer. At the present time all medical and dental officers receive special pay of \$100 per month. Under this bill, medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active service will continue to receive the \$100 per month. Those with between 2 and 6 years of active service will receive \$150 per month in special pay; those with between 6 and 10 years, \$200 per month; and those with more than 10 years, \$250 per month. The purpose of these graduated increases is to make the military compensation more competitive with that of civilian physicians of similar experience and to provide a greater inducement to remain on active duty. We hope it will provide the inducement which will cause medical and dental officers to remain on active duty and make a career of the armed services.

The committee amended the bill so as to place the first increase at the end of 2 years, rather than after 3 years of active duty. The term of service under the doctor draft law is 2 years, and more than 90 percent of those entering under that law leave the service as their 2-year period expires. It appeared that a greater number might remain if the first increase were offered at the end of the obligated period. The additional estimated cost of this provision is \$9,878,200. The total cost of this bill for the first fiscal year following enactment is expected to be \$19,455,200.

Mr. President, the Department of Defense and the committees of Congress which are charged with the primary re-

sponsibility of recommending legislation which will assure medical and dental aid to the men in the armed services have exhausted every available recourse in an effort to provide an adequate number of doctors and dentists for the armed services. We have resorted to the draft, and it now appears that the pool available from the draft is about to be exhausted.

I only wish we had some other means than that provided by this bill, but no other course apparently is available to us than to increase the compensation, as an incentive for doctors and dentists to make a career of the Armed Forces.

We cannot fail in our responsibility to those whom we have called into the service, many of them against their will, to see that they have adequate medical and dental treatment.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill unanimously.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add a few words to what the chairman of the committee has said. He and I have considered this subject for a considerable number of years. The previous bill which was passed was an incentive bill. That bill has not succeeded in holding doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces. This is an additional incentive bill, which we hope will be successful in causing doctors and dentists to make a career of the service and provide needed medical attention for the boys of America who are now serving and who will be called upon to serve in the Armed Forces.

I commend the chairman of the committee for what he has said. I agree with him heartily. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee. We believe it is the only step which can be taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 9.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "make", to strike out "original"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "enactment" and insert "effective date"; in line 6, after the word "the", to insert "effective"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "effective"; in the same line, after the word "date", to strike out "of enactment"; on page 4, line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "enactment" and insert "effective date"; on page 5, line 23, after the word "such", to insert "medical"; on page 6, after line 5, to strike out "and the service credit authorized by this clause shall not be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retire-

ment or separation from the service, under any provision of law" and insert "and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the service credit authorized by this clause shall not—

"(A) be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retirement or separation from the service, under any provision of law;

"(B) increase the retired or retirement pay of a person who became entitled to such pay prior to May 1, 1956; or

"(C) increase the retired pay of a person who becomes entitled to such pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1087), on or after May 1, 1956, but who does not perform active duty after May 1, 1956."

After line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Any medical officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who—

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. Title II of the Public Health Service Act (act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 683), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

#### "PROMOTION CREDIT—ASSISTANT GRADE

"SEC. 220. Any medical officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who—

On page 7, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(1) (A)"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(2)"; in line 20, after the word "such", to strike out "date." and insert "date.""; after line 23, to strike out:

(1) By repealing so much of sections 211 (e) (1) and 311 (d) (3) as relates to officers of the Medical Corps and Dental Corps of the Navy.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(1) By inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 211 (e) and in the first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 311 (d), after the words "a staff corps", the words "other than the Medical and Dental Corps", and deleting in those sentences the words "if of other than the Medical Corps, and in the preceding calendar year if of the Medical Corps."

On page 8, line 18, after the numeral "5", to insert "(a)"; in line 25, after the word "completed", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "those", to insert "veterinary"; in line 7, after the word "least", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; after line 19, to insert:

(b) Section 203 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out the following words in the third proviso: "of \$100 per month as is."

After line 22, to insert:

SEC. 6. Any person who, on the day before the effective date of this act, has not completed 18 years of service creditable in the computation of active duty pay in the uniformed service of which he is a member and who, as a result of the enactment of this act, is upon the effective date of this act credited with more than 17 years of such service shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be allowed 12 months from the effective date of this act within which to make the election provided for in section 3 (a) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 502).

And, on page 10, at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "6" to "7."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9428) was read the third time, and passed.

#### PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that the yeas and nays on the pending amendment have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

#### ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 16, 1956, p. 6371, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make on the report.

Late last session the Senate passed Senate bill 1287, which made certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement system. Subsequently the House of Representatives amended the bill. Prior to adjournment it was impossible to reconcile the differences between the House

and the Senate versions of Senate bill 1287.

A conference has now been held; and the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report.

The House and Senate versions of Senate bill 1287 differed in two respects.

In the first place, the Senate version provided for a graduated system of increases to be given to the annuitants under the system. The House version gave annuitants an across-the-board, cost-of-living increase in their annuities in an amount not to exceed \$324 a year.

The Senate conferees accepted the House version, which provides for a flat across-the-board increase in annuities for annuitants who retired prior to July 1, 1949. This increase in annuities will give Foreign Service officers the same increase in annuities which was given to civil-service employees in 1952.

The second difference between the House version of Senate bill 1287 and the Senate version related to a House provision which would have authorized the Secretary of State to make loans or grants to certain categories of widows of retired Foreign Service officers. The Senate conferees felt that this provision would establish a bad precedent and might get the Secretary of State into the loan business.

As a result of the conference, changes were made in Senate bill 1287, and these changes will make it possible for a limited class of needy widows of Foreign Service officers to receive annuities of up to \$1,200 a year.

The Senate conferees are satisfied that the conference report on Senate bill 1287 represents a reasonable compromise between provisions of the House version of the bill and the Senate version. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall address myself to the subject of the President's veto of the farm bill.

American farmers are rightfully indignant and deeply shocked by the unwise action of our President in vetoing the urgently needed farm bill.

They have had a chance now to read the President's veto message, and to hear his personal explanation.

I submit they are still shocked. They have every right to be.

If anything, the President's radio and television message of explanation compounded the inconsistencies and inaccuracies of his veto message.

Farmers, as fellow citizens, have a right to expect their President not to mislead them, not to distort the facts.

The glib assumptions of the President's message and his political appeal supporting it have not been upheld in the record of debate on this floor; they are not upheld by the official facts and figures of the Department of Agriculture; they are not warranted by the actual experience of farmers themselves under our farm programs.

It is an amazing sight to see a President of the United States go before the American people on television and insist he will not tolerate any "politics" on farm issues, when he knows better. If he does not, it is only a greater reflection upon him and upon those around him.

If ever there has been partisan politics injected into a farm policy decision, it has been done so by President Eisenhower's own administration.

The White House, Secretary Benson, and spokesmen for Republican farm policy on this floor have consistently and continually refused to work with a Democratic Congress in a true bipartisan sense to develop constructive farm legislation.

Instead, they have come to us and said, in effect, "This is our program—take it or leave it. If you have any ideas of your own to improve it, we will toss the whole thing out the window."

And that is just what they have now done.

The farm bill sent to the White House was worked out by the Democratic leadership with effective bipartisan cooperation on our appropriate committees and supported by farm State representatives of both parties on the floor of the Senate and the House.

Forty-eight Republican Members of the House from the great farming areas of the Nation voted for it.

Fifteen Republican Senators representing key farm States supported it.

Five out of the seven Republican Members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture voted for the conference bill sent to the President for approval.

I submit, Mr. President, that that is bipartisanship at the congressional level on the part of those most responsible for farm legislation. Yet the President turned it down because it was not the "party line" that he and his prime minister Sherman Adams, and his Republican Party leaders had laid down.

If the President now tries to publicly wash his hands of partisanship in this farm fight, what does he have to say about the great advertising campaign of the Senate and House Republican campaign committees in support of the "Eisenhower-Republican farm program?"

That was the advertising campaign under which farmers were to send in a coupon and get the Eisenhower program.

If the President now tries to project himself into the role of a man standing firmly on principle, worried about surpluses, what does he have to say about his own Secretary of Agriculture wheeling and dealing for Senate votes by offering concessions of increased acreage allotments and higher prices in a brazen



attempt to influence Senators to help him save face, whatever the loss to America's farmers and American taxpayers.

There could be no more misleading propaganda perpetrated upon the American people than the President's attempt to lay on the Democrats in the Congress the blame for "delay" on effective action to halt the farm recession.

How many times, Mr. President, have we heard that there was great delay? Yet, the President received the bill on Wednesday, after it was passed by the Senate, but it was not until Monday that any final action by the President was taken.

Where was his concern for a soil bank on September 30, last fall, when his own executive department Bureau of the Budget concurred in the Department of Agriculture's report opposing soil bank legislation which I had introduced a year ago?

The President rejected a soil-bank proposal which was almost identical to the one passed by both Houses.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. That is a point which seems to have escaped the attention of some people. If the President wants to lay blame for delay, he should accept blame for delaying the matter for 3 years, because for the first 3 years of the present administration the President and his administration opposed the soil bank concept.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. He opposed specific legislative proposals. There were 2 or 3 such proposals in the Senate and half a dozen or more in the House. I shall show in this address that the President's own administration could have had a soil bank under existing law if he had wanted to, and can still have.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection, I should like to call the Senator's attention to something which occurred in the House yesterday, and which is covered at page 6422 of the RECORD, dealing with the same subject. I was just reading the debate.

A very fine Representative from Minnesota, with whom I served in the House and whom I know quite well, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, who is a member of the Republican Party, said this in talking about the soil bank. First, I shall read what Representative POAGE of Texas said:

Mr. POAGE. I have here with me today a copy of letters from the Department of Agriculture written less than 9 months ago condemning this soil bank, in which the Secretary advises the Committee on Agriculture that he then considered it too expensive and unworkable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be interested to know that we were talking about \$500 million and the President wanted a billion and a quarter dollars?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me read what Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN said:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The hearings before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture will show that on January 28, 1954, Mr. Benson in direct answer to a question I asked with reference to what was wrong with the general principle of establishing such a soil bank informed us that in his opinion it was unworkable. He said there were many things wrong with the principles of such a program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama and, also, the Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. President, where was the President's concern over delay in getting started when his own Secretary of Agriculture came before our Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on January 12 of this year and admitted they had not yet worked out detailed suggestions or recommendations on the workings of a soil bank, but were just then rushing to get them prepared?

Where was his concern over delay when the Senate deferred action after the Senate Committee reported its bill February 10, to allow a 10-day period for Republican orators to tour the country making Lincoln Day fund-raising speeches for the Republican Party?

I am not objecting to that. That is done under a gentlemen's understanding, and it is entirely appropriate. But it always seems that when there is a delay the President finds it convenient to lay the blame on the Democratic side.

Where was his concern over the economic plight of farmers when his Secretary of Agriculture established new low support levels for 1956 crops—levels the President now offers grudgingly to partially raise in return for depriving farmers of the fair price levels Congress determined they were entitled to?

If the Eisenhower administration finds justification and authority now to voluntarily increase farm price-support levels to some degree after veto of the farm bill which would have provided far more effective farm income protection, why did not the same justification and authority exist when Secretary Benson earlier established the lower support levels?

Mr. President, I think that is a fair question. The President is establishing new support levels—he announced it in his veto message and on the radio and on the television—on the basis of the law of 1954. That law, Mr. President, was in effect in January, February, March, and April of this year. It has not been changed.

How does it happen that wheat was 76 percent of parity before the veto and has gone up to 84 percent of parity after the veto?

Mr. President, the law laid down eight criteria for the Secretary to use in deciding on support levels. He is obligated to use them. If he does not, he must make a public explanation.

I should like to know what has happened in the past 2 weeks in connection with the surplus of wheat and the pro-

duction of wheat which allowed the President administratively to raise support levels. The only thing that has happened is the approach of an election.

I say, here and now, that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have an obligation under the law, which I shall read subsequently, to announce why they made these decisions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wondered if it had occurred to the Senator from Minnesota that the idea behind raising the support level was that an election is in prospect? We are now seeing some indication of the many things which could have been done during the past 3 years to help the farmers, and which the administration has deliberately refrained from doing. In other words, it is possible that many things which the administration is proceeding to do now, could have been done during the past 3 years in order to increase farm income by more than a billion dollars a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on the most important factor in the debate and squabble on farm legislation. It is now obvious to every farmer that the administration has been crudely, rudely, and in a Scrooge-like manner, denying to farmers reasonable prices for their products. We now have evidence, by way of the veto message, that any time the President wants to raise the support levels, he can do so. So it can only be that he purposely, and with design, forced prices down. Now, with Mr. Eisenhower's willful action, administratively, under the same law, the price support level is raised—or, more correctly, not lowered as much as they originally planned—as a means of throwing a sop to the farmers' well-being, thinking that they will forget the many months of depressed prices they have had to suffer.

What has been the change in the economic facts involved in the conflicting decisions other than the belated election year recognition of farm protests against the administration's gross neglect of agriculture? President Eisenhower says, "We now have sound, forward looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954." Yet it was under that Act that Secretary Benson fixed the support levels originally announced for 1956. It must be assumed that Secretary Benson used the criteria established in the act in arriving at the announced price support levels. Whatever discretionary authority the President or the Secretary now has to make adjustments related to economic conditions in agriculture, he also had before. Whatever information the administration officials now have about depressed conditions in agriculture they had available then—if they had cared to consider that vital fact.

Does the President now say that the Secretary of Agriculture grossly misjudged the factors involved in setting the lower support levels under the flexible support theory? Is the President saying to the people of America and to Congress, via his veto message, his radio

program, and his television program, that Ezra Taft Benson not only is a poor Secretary of Agriculture, but that he does not even know arithmetic?

The support levels announced by Secretary Benson were announced under the President's authority. It is Mr. Eisenhower's farm program, not poor Benson's. It is Mr. Eisenhower who is responsible. Is Mr. Eisenhower saying to the farmer that he did not know what was in the Agricultural Act of 1954? Is he saying to the farmer that even if he had known what was in the Act of 1954, he thought the farmers ought to suffer a little more? Is that why he cut the support levels down? Is that why he pulled down the support level for wheat? Is that why it was cut down for corn? I want some explanation from this "principled administration."

Is the President of the United States saying that the flexible support theory should not be quite so flexible in an election year? Is that what he is saying? Is he saying that a little of the flex ought to be taken out every time a presidential election comes around? Or is he saying, "We are going to dip into the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the Republican campaign expenses"? That is what he was saying in the veto message.

I was of the opinion that Congress wrote the law. I was of the opinion that once a law was in operation, a law such as the act of 1954, there had to be some continuity to it. But no. By one simple twist of the dial, by a television script, by a veto message, farm prices are raised overnight in Washington, administratively, from the White House—and under the same old law.

Mr. President, I say this is not "principled" action. I say that, at best, it shows one of two things: Either the Department of Agriculture or the President did not know what was being done before last week; therefore, they have now come around to admitting their grievous errors of judgment at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to the American farmers and the American economy. Or they are merely playing politics by changing the support levels overnight, in order to ease the blow of an unjustified veto.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota inform the junior Senator from Tennessee whether the old price support levels, the price support levels previously announced by Secretary Benson, are in conformity with the formulas and the requirements of the 1954 act; or whether the new, recently announced, politically announced, price support levels are in conformity with the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Rather than to pose as a judge in that matter, let me say that if the new announced support levels are supported by the criteria in the 1954 act, then, indeed, the levels of last week were not supported by the criteria. If that is the case, then we ought to get a new Department of Agriculture, starting with the Secretary; and

it might be well, also, to get someone new at the top, through a change in the White House, namely, a new President; because if the President can be that wrong, and if his Secretary of Agriculture can be that wrong, then this is too expensive an administration, because its actions have cost the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would it be reasonable to deduce from these circumstances that one of the inequities of the flexible-price-support program is that it is subject to political manipulation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. How right the Senator from Tennessee is. The program seems to become much more firm in its flexibility in about April, May, and June of a presidential election year. One of the real reasons for a mandatory price-support program is that it does not make any difference whether a farmer votes or not; he is under a price-support level provided by the law passed by Congress. It does not make any difference whether he is a Republican or a Democrat; he gets the price-support level provided by the law passed by Congress.

I charge on the floor now that the administration is openly playing politics with the price-support program of 1954.

Mr. GORE. That being true, would the Senator not think the farmers could more safely rely upon the price-support levels determined by Congress, as contained in the law, than to leave their fate to the political manipulations of the party bosses in an election year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. Again I may say that his perception is equal to his good judgment, and both are superlative.

Mr. President, some of the press critics of effective farm legislation so jubilant over the President's veto need to do a little soul searching before they jump to such hasty conclusions as they have as to who is standing on principle and who is not, who is being consistent and who is not, who is doing what is really best for our economy and who is not.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that the Wall Street Journal has endorsed the President's action in this matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not been fully aware of that fact, but I may say I am not surprised. I would rather have expected it, since many of the announcements of the administration on agriculture have come from that great newspaper.

Mr. KERR. In view of the fact that Benson and the Wall Street Journal have agreed on what the farm policy ought to be, and that the President has come out with such a program, does the Senator not feel that perhaps he should evaluate his position, and see if he would be justified in taking a position inconsistent with the one they take?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is a valuable suggestion for the President. I may say if the President would evalu-

ate anything he has done, it would be helpful to the American people.

Mr. KERR. I agree with the Senator, but in view of the fact that the Wall Street Journal has endorsed his position so completely, is it not possible that the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oklahoma, who have been so positive in their condemnation of the President, might reevaluate the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Wall Street Journal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator has a point. I gather his point is that after hearing from the Wall Street Journal's "experts" in the field of agriculture, we might want to reevaluate our own criticisms of the President's action?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the reasons why the President and the Wall Street Journal were interested in the farm bill was that the bill had the words "soil bank" in it. Immediately there was a great reaction in the administration. They said, "A bank! A bank! It must be good." Immediately financial publications, such as Barron's Weekly, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Journal of Commerce, said, "A bank!" The word "soil" did not mean too much, but the word "bank" set up a whole chain reaction. The President, along with Benson, his great Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, who, by the way, is not related to me biologically or politically, saw the word "bank" in the bill, and said, "It must be good." The Federal Reserve banks have been constantly fooling around with the discount rate; and that is what the administration has been doing with the price supports.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will yield, I should like to point out that they are related on the basis of an inverse ratio, interest rates going up, and price supports going down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true. Price supports for financial institutions have gone up, and price supports for farmers have gone down. Do not think the administration is not for price supports. It depends on who would be affected by them. We do not want to be unkind to them. They are really for price supports.

Mr. KERR. And for Dixon-Yates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For Dixon-Yates.

Mr. KERR. And high interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. High interest rates; discount rates; and for price supports, but not for farmers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I suppose the Senator noticed over the past weekend, while the President was considering vetoing the farm bill, that his administration increased the rediscount interest rates by one-half of one percent. Did he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration did that; and they did not have to have any hearings on it; there was no delay.

Mr. LONG. Before the day was over, the Chase National Bank also raised its interest rates to keep them in line with those of the Federal Reserve Board.



Mr. HUMPHREY. It is always cooperating with the administration.

Mr. LONG. I am sure that by Monday every bank of any consequence had raised the interest rates which will be charged farmers and other individuals, including interest rates charged the Federal Government for interest on the Government's own debt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They will cooperate to the last digit and the last nickel on increased interest rates they can get from everyone.

Mr. LONG. One of these days I hope to compute how much the increases in the interest rates by the administration have cost the farmers and the general consumers of the Nation. I would assume the figure to be somewhere between \$1½ billion and \$2 billion. Someone should take a look at the cost of the increased interest rates the administration has imposed on the people, without consultation with Congress or anyone else, but to help out those who lend money, at the expense of the Government and most of the people who have borrowed money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the Senator will admit that the administration has been efficient and there has been no delay in fulfilling its obligation to provide price supports. It did not make clear, price supports on what. The first act of the administration in 1953 was to raise interest rates for agriculture.

Mr. LONG. Over the weekend the administration did not see anything wrong in increasing the interest rates charged to those who borrow money, by one-half of one percent, while at the same time it killed the bill to benefit the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These are matters which have been discussed before the Committee on Finance. At least, they have been discussed after the fact. I regret the Senator's advice was not sought beforehand, but the administration likes to move rapidly.

Mr. LONG. Banks got an increase in their price supports at the same time farmers got a decrease in their price supports.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a perfectly consistent action on the part of the administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not sure there is any relation to the question of parity, but I wonder if the increase in interest rates which was put into effect over the weekend, while the President was deciding to veto price supports for farmers, was a 90-percent support price, or was it approaching 100 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I take it the administration is approaching the great goal of 100 percent in the market place. It is the market, but not the livestock market. It is the stock market, the blue-chip market.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from Minnesota which market place he was referring to, but now he has answered the question I intended to ask him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has been so much a part of the struggle to obtain equality for agriculture, will agree with me that generally, when a Republican President is in the White House and when the Republican Party is feeling its strength, there are two obvious economic facts in American life: low agricultural prices and high New York stock-market prices—or, at least, for a while; sometimes they decline, as occurred in 1932.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the Chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The result of the first interest-rate manipulation was to reduce from three to two the number of bedrooms in a house a veteran could purchase with a given payment. The junior Senator from Tennessee would like to know how many bedrooms there are in the house a veteran can buy now with the same amount of money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure what the decrease will be in the number of bedrooms; but I suggest that such a veteran will be rather crowded in living in the few bedrooms he will have left, because the walls are tightening in on him as a result of the last little "deal" to which the Senator from Louisiana referred.

Furthermore, I recall the report made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in regard to what I believe was a \$14,000 home. The action of the administration resulted in reducing the size of such a home by one bedroom. In short, the administration said, "If you have a large family, you will have to crowd up a little bit."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me suggest that in that process, still another room has been removed from the house such a person could afford, because in the last year the average price of homes in the United States rose \$1,400, and the price is still rising.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And if that continues, some folk will have to sleep in the parks.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps that is one of the considerations back of the proposal to prevent further increases in the population of the United States—because there would be no place for them to sleep.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly that is a very helpful comment in connection with this discussion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to a Senator on this side of the aisle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; for I wish to be fair to Senators on that side of the aisle.

However, Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Indiana, I should like to give the Senator from Indiana several little tidbits on which he will be able to chew for a while.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, since the Senator from Minnesota is trying to straighten out his understanding of this matter, I shall be glad to throw a little more light on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have the Senator from Indiana do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to help keep the record straight. Let me point out that in the 3½ years since Mr. Eisenhower has been President of the United States, there has not been an increase in the cost of living. In other words, what the people buy today costs no more than it would have cost 3 years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me interrupt the Senator from Indiana at that point. I think the statement he has made is a fair one, but I think a word of explanation in that connection might be helpful. As the prices of processed and manufactured goods have risen and as interest rates have risen—and they have—and as the carrying charges which farmers have to pay have risen and as the wages of other groups of the population have risen, the prices of farm commodities have gone down. So the administration has been able to keep some sort of economic balance, by having the prices of some things go up, and the prices of others go down. Of course, that development unbalances the situation of some folk, although it makes a fairly good statistical picture.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Minnesota also said that when the Republicans are in power, farm prices go down and New York Stock Market prices go up.

Let me say that during my lifetime there have been three Democratic Presidents—Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. All three of them involved the United States in war. Therefore, let me ask the Senator from Minnesota this question: Is it just as honest to say that when we have a Democratic President, we are involved in war, as it is to say that when we have a Republican President, farm prices are low and New York Stock Market prices are high? Is one statement as honest as the other?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana has asked me the question, and I would reply by saying "No." [Laughter.] That is a simple and an honest answer.

I have always been interested in the knowledge of history that my Republican friends have. They have a wonderful way of being able to ignore any chapters of history that are slightly distasteful to them. For instance, they ignore the existence of such a person as Hitler. In the minds of our Republican friends, such a person never existed. Likewise, so far as my Republican friends are concerned, Pearl Harbor never happened—or, if it did, it was only another Republican parade with firecrackers. Similarly, in the minds of my Republican friends, there never were such persons as Tojo or Stalin.

Such a point of view on the part of my Republican friends indicates to me that

if one is able to close his mind to certain chapters of history, he can live a rather blissful, peaceful life.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me, to permit me to ask two questions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Indiana called attention to the fact that the cost of living has been about the same for the past 3 years. Is it not a definite and accepted fact that the American farmer is the goat of that situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not also a fact that the American farmer has had to suffer the depressing influence of reduced agricultural prices, and that the prices of agricultural commodities have been reduced in order to absorb the increase which has occurred in the prices of all commodities except those produced on the farms?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is absolutely correct; and the statement he has made is supported by all the statistical data which comes from the Government.

Mr. KERR. Now let me refer to 100 percent of parity in the market place, insofar as the farmer is concerned. Is it not a fact that the one time during the past three decades when the farmer had full parity in the market place for his products was during the administration of Herbert Hoover?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator please repeat his question? The suggestion he makes in it is a rather shocking one.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the only time in the past three decades when the farmer has had full parity in the market place—that is to say, the full benefit of the law of supply and demand, and also as regards the operations of the speculators and the full evil effect of such operations—was during the administration of Herbert Hoover?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think he came as close to reaching that objective as any man I know of.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that no effort was made to prevent the prices of farm products from finding whatever level the operation of the law of supply and demand and the operations of the speculators would drive them to?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, except I wish to point out that in order to keep the record straight, we should say that in 1930 and 1931 the old Federal Farm Board engaged in some activities which were too little and too late—which is another chapter in the book of the Republican doxology.

Mr. KERR. Was that the Board which advocated helping the wheat farmer by placing a bonus on the price of flour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems to me that something of that sort was involved.

Mr. KERR. Just as Secretary Benson has tried to help the livestock producers by giving a bonus to the packers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. There seems to be a strange similarity and affinity there.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that the Farm Board was created and that \$500 million was appropriated by Congress for the operations of the Board. But the \$500 million and the farmers all went down the drain together as a result.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what we call a great engineering feat—ditching the dam and draining the country in one fell swoop.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the statement has been made that the cost of living today is about the same as it has been during the past 3 years, it might be well to point out that, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, in that process some persons have done better and some persons have done worse. For example, the corporations with assets of more than \$100 million have seen their profits increase by 27 percent. Those are the figures of the Eisenhower administration. Those with assets of \$250,000 or less have seen their profits reduced by 39 percent, while the farmer has seen his income reduced by \$4 billion. The persons who collect interest on money have seen their incomes increased by approximately \$2 billion. So the cost of living is the same. It has only been shifted. Those in the upper brackets are making more and those in the lower brackets are making less. At least, some people can be happy. The economy is balanced. Some are getting more and some are getting less.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He is always on the job when it comes to economic analysis. I know of no Senator who has contributed more to an objective, accurate appraisal of these figures than has the Senator from Louisiana. I accept his figures. I am sure they are supported by the reports of the Senator's own Committee on Small Business.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In order that the statement of our distinguished colleague from Louisiana may be understood, the decrease of \$4 billion which the farmer has suffered is a decrease in his take-home pay, his take-home income, or net.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. It is a \$4 billion net decrease.

Mr. KERR. That is, according to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. A few days ago a panel of economists from the Reserve board headquarters in the district of which Oklahoma is a part conducted a panel discussion in a bankers' convention in Oklahoma. They announced that the average farm income in Oklahoma for 1955 was \$1,200 per family, which represented a decrease of \$1,000 per family in 3 years. That demonstrates that actually the take-home pay of the average farm family during the past 3 years has been reduced nearly one-half.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that observation. I am sure the Senator would be interested in knowing that the college of agriculture at Ames, Iowa, in a recent study in Iowa,

demonstrated that last year there was a 50-percent reduction in cash income of Iowa farmers. In Minnesota we have seen a very substantial reduction in income of farmers, and a rise in indebtedness.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Oklahoma made the statement a few moments ago that the Department of Agriculture had undertaken to support the price of hogs by a bonus to the packers. If that be true, what kind of products would the Senator from Minnesota or the senior Senator from Oklahoma say the Department of Agriculture actually bought?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall make one comment, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The study which we placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was a review of statistical evidence relating to purchases by the Department of finished pork products from packers, revealed that every time the Department of Agriculture bought pork products, the price of pork went up and the price of hogs went down. That is shown by the records of the Department of Agriculture. That was true in every instance, with 1 or 2 exceptions. I think there were two times when the purchase program resulted in an increase in the return to the producer of hogs.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he must give the Department of Agriculture full credit. It has boosted the price of canned pork gravy to the packer more than 10 percent as a result of this operation.

Today the Department of Agriculture, after having bought more than \$100 million worth of pork products, including a very substantial amount of canned pork gravy, has succeeded in lifting the price of the delectable, desirable, incomparable product of pork gravy to the point where it is paying nearly 70 cents a pound. When the program started, it was at the pitifully low price of about 62 cents.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] once said, the Department was proving that, although the man who raised the hog and kept him for 7 months received only 10 cents a pound, the packer, for keeping him about 30 minutes, was getting a differential of more than 50 cents a pound. As the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma said, the hog could have stayed at the Waldorf-Astoria for an equal length of time for less.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma for their very delightful and enlightening contribution on the subject of political gravy. That is apparently what has been the result, when we consider the President's veto in the light of some of the recent actions with respect to the farm-price-support level.

If we consider the veto message line by line, we find it filled with inconsistencies. The President professes worry



about accumulating more surpluses of feed grains, then vetoes the first action this Congress has ever taken to cut back production of feed grains.

I wish to be charitable to the President. I am sure he did not know that there was something in the bill which would have cut back the production of feed grains. The bill would have made a mandatory reduction of 15 percent in the acreage of feed grains. That would not have resulted in the production of more feed grains, but less feed grains. However, for what the farmer did produce, he would receive a fair and reasonable price.

So, if the President wishes to reconsider the veto message—I do not know whether there is precedent for it—if he will look into the feed-grain section of the bill as passed by Congress, he will find that for the first time in the history of the Congress a measure was enacted by Congress to cut back the production of feed grains. Yet the President went on the radio and television and told the people that the bill would expand the production of feed grains. I am sure he meant it. I am sure he thought it would. I am sure Benson never told him to the contrary. Sherman Adams undoubtedly did not know about it, because he does not produce enough feed grains to enable him to know about it. I am sure no one told the President about it, or he would not have misled the American people. I do not say that the President purposely or intentionally misleads the people. I simply say that he did not know what was in the bill. If he did know, he would be guilty of a purposeful deception of the American people. However, I do not think he would do so.

It is time someone really challenged the fiction this administration is peddling as fact about all the depressed farm prices being the result of surpluses.

It is not Government-owned surpluses that depress prices; it is how the Government handles those surpluses.

How can commodities in the Government's hands depress the cash markets below support levels if the law requires, as it does, that the Government shall not sell those commodities at less than the full support price plus 5 percent and carrying charges?

I will tell Senators how it happens. It happens only because the administration uses every loophole to avoid that law, and to dump products on the market in direct competition with the producer at cutrate competition.

Before the President does much more talking about surpluses, I ask once again for him to tell this Congress just what really is surplus and what is not. His own Secretary was unable to do so, and his own Office of Defense Mobilization was unable to do so.

What a strange situation confronts us. Here we are in Congress, asked to spend billions to correct a situation of surpluses, and yet this administration has never, to my knowledge, informed either the Congress or its committees where it draws the line between what is surplus and what is normal safe reserves for the protection of the Nation's interest.

If the Government regards everything that passes through its hands in the Commodity Credit Corporation as surplus then it is hopelessly confused.

For this administration, by embarking on policies of bringing farm prices down on the one hand while supposedly trying to keep them up through loan programs on the other, has driven more and more commodities into its own hands and taken over more and more of the normal marketing functions of private producers and private traders.

The result of this Department's bungling administration has been less free trade and less free markets, not more.

The Government itself has cornered the market, and has steered it downward, instead of upward. Its actions have devalued its own commodity holdings and expanded losses to the taxpayers, as well as expanding loss to farmers.

I would like to ask one simple question: Does anyone think that if any one smart private trader in this country had control of as great a proportion of our farm commodities as the Department of Agriculture has, he could not influence the market upward or downward?

Imagine, Mr. President, a trader in a particular commodity getting literally a corner on the market. Does any Senator believe that such a trader would not force prices up, instead of down? Of course he would. Yet our Government, which has these great quantities of commodities, says it will not use them to build a better price structure. Instead, Mr. President, it will use them to depress the price structure.

I say on the floor of the Senate, as a Member of the Senate and on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, that anyone who goes to the Chicago Board of Trade or to the Minneapolis Grain Exchange and speaks to the men in those exchanges, who are actually in the market, will be told by them that the present administration has done more to usurp the powers of a normal free trade in the grain market than has any other administration in our history. They will make clear that our Department of Agriculture has purposely and intentionally depressed prices. I have submitted for the Record in months past, letters, telegrams, and other communications from boards of trade and from important exporters and traders in the field of agricultural commodities which show that to be the fact.

We have far lower farm prices than economically necessary under existing conditions simply because the Department of Agriculture has refused to "freeze" its holdings to force prices up to support levels.

We have more commodities going through the Government's hands and being labeled "surplus" because of just such mismanagement.

Unless farmers call a halt to it in November, it is now obvious that we are in for more mismanagement and more low prices despite anything Congress tries to do about it.

Farmers needed the bill sent to the White House by this Congress. Our country needed it.

As I said earlier in my remarks, more than 40 Republican Members of the House of Representatives and 15 Republican Members of the Senate joined with the Democrats in Congress in getting that bill to the President. Those are men who live in farm areas. They are men who understand farm problems. They worked hard and conscientiously to bring about good legislation.

Conscientious men worked long and hard to develop that bill to meet acute problems in our economy. It is a dangerous disservice to intimate, as some have mistakenly done, that it was a mere gesture deliberately developed to force a Presidential veto.

I do not know a supporter of that bill who did not urge that it be signed into law.

In fact, I thought the bill would be signed. I could not conceive the President of the United States vetoing it, when, at the most, there was only a 1-year extension of what he thought were high support levels, and when at the same time he was getting almost everything else he had asked for, and particularly when the 1954 act was not being basically repealed or amended. Nevertheless, the President vetoed the bill.

It was Republican opponents of the bill who urged its veto, not Democratic supporters.

I can hardly conceive of our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle cooperating so readily in obtaining this veto if, as some have tried to say, it was Democratic strategy to get a veto.

Certainly, I am convinced a veto will be politically beneficial to the Democratic Party. Because it emphasizes more than our words could do the underlying philosophy of this administration against effective aid for agriculture.

But there could be no better test of putting farm welfare above political advantage than the serious effort made by a Democratic Congress to enact an effective, workable farm bill in a election year, so the Republican President would not have to campaign for reelection in quite as bad an economic climate in our rural areas.

We put the well-being of our farmers above our politics. We put the country's interest first. Seldom has there been such solid nonpartisan cooperation in the great Midwest farm areas. Yet our guidance is spurned. Our efforts are rejected. And our intelligence—and the intelligence of farmers—is insulted by the President's explanation of his actions.

Apparently, this veto was felt required, whatever the cost in human suffering to our farm population, to perpetuate the myth that "Republicans can do no wrong." They had hewed to a party line based on preconceived notions, and refused to face the facts that now confront them proving they have been wrong.

My deepest regret, of course, is for our farmers themselves.

My next deepest regret is for Republican members of the Senate and House from farm areas, who have been betrayed by the leaders of their own party, and have had exposed for all their constituents to see how little consideration

the President gives to the views of his own party's representatives from the great rural States most vitally hit by this action.

Even governors of rural States pleaded with the President to sign the bill. No one said it was a perfect bill. No one said that every part of the bill was the last word in legislative perfection. No piece of legislation is perfect. However, at least the bill approached the goal and the objective of a sounder agricultural economy than we have today.

The crowning climax has been the President's suggestion of an advance payment to farmers this year—Mr. President, I ask Senators to listen to this particularly—the crowning climax has been the President's suggestion of an advance payment to farmers this year if they will agree to participate in a soil bank next year. I have never heard of such a reckless proposal relating to the public Treasury. It is a proposal to advance payments to farmers for doing something next year. What if they do not follow through next year, after they get their advanced payment this year? Are we to have district attorneys and marshals running willy-nilly over the countryside prosecuting farmers?

It is nothing more than a brazenly ridiculous election-year-bribe attempt that farmers will resent as insulting.

I think I know our Midwest farmers. Farmers will not like being denied decent prices for what they produce in one breath, and then being promised a charity check for doing nothing in the next breath, in the apparent hope they can be bribed into silence instead of fighting for equity and justice.

No one wants improved farm legislation this year, as quickly as possible, any more than I do. I include myself in the majority of the Senate who want action as quickly as possible.

But the President knows—or should know—that he has killed the best Congress can offer this year.

When this bill was before the Senate, Senator after Senator offered amendment after amendment trying desperately to obtain further improvement for farmers in his particular State. Those men represent farm people. That is what we have legislatures for. We have a representative Government, not a rubber stamp Government.

According to the President's action, we do not even need to be here to represent our people. I suggest that we know a little more about the intimate and detailed needs of our farm economy in our respective areas than some adviser in the White House. There are more advisers at the White House than there have ever been there before, although they are not so good as some have been in the past. The quantity has gone up, but the quality has gone down. Advisers are not always as closely identified with the needs of the people as those who have worked with the people year after year and who are privileged to serve the people as elected officials.

The offering of the many amendments to the farm bill was no idle gesture; it was a sincere effort to take care of the

economic problems of the people by representatives who were elected to serve them.

It was not only Democrats who offered such amendments. Republicans offered as many as Democrats did, reflecting their own conviction that farmers of their respective areas needed something better than this administration had to offer.

One of the objections offered by the President to signing the farm bill, for example, was its two-price plans for wheat and rice. It was a Republican Senator, staunch supporter of the President, who in good faith offered the amendment to add a two-price plan for wheat to protect the farmers of his State. And I am sure some of my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, if they are not now too embarrassed to tell the truth, could tell us that certain spokesmen for the White House gave them the "green light" to vote for that amendment, assuring them the White House had no objection. Of course, another spokesman for the White House was busy assuring opponents of the amendment at the same time that the White House agreed with them. In other words, the White House was working both sides of the street, and apparently from both sides of the White House. That was only one of the many tragic inconsistencies of the White House on this entire farm policy action.

The members of the press corps know that what I have said is true. They know that one representative of the White House contacted Members of Congress urging them to vote for the two-price plan, saying that the plan was agreeable to the administration.

But the White House knows well that any new attempt to bring soil bank legislation before this Congress would only result in renewed attempts by Members of Congress—by Republicans as well as Democrats—to amend it further to include provisions they feel necessary to take care of the needs of their farmer constituents. When it was all over, we would be right back where we started from.

The new White House appeal for separate soil bank action is merely a hollow political gesture, an unfair political gesture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator realizes that if a bill providing for a soil bank were brought before the Congress today—and I hope we can divorce it from what the Senator thinks is a wholly political gesture—and if, as a result of the very solid conviction the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I, and other Senators, have on the subject, we could pass such a soil bank bill, the benefits of such a program would be made available to the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe in the soil-bank program. I am talking about the hue and cry that it can be done only by new legislation, and I ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to bear with me a few moments, and I think he will see the merit of my position.

Mr. President, if this administration feels as strongly about the need for a soil-bank program for production adjustment, why has it not put one into effect long ago?

Why did it not accept the proposal we had before it last year?

Why did it not submit budget requests for carrying out such a program under existing authorization?

I will challenge this administration to say it has no authority now to carry out the very same soil-bank program, merely by asking for necessary appropriations and perhaps expanding the appropriation authority.

Why has it deceived farmers and the American people into thinking it could not do a thing without a new act?

Everyone in the Department of Agriculture knows better. The Department of Agriculture's general counsel knows they have general authority for such a program—even specific direction for it. The Secretary of Agriculture knows it, even if the President does not.

Furthermore, Mr. President, they know they have been talking about it within the past 3 days. They know there have been meetings in the Department, and they found that authority. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture does not seem to be able to act. One of the purposes of a soil-bank bill, the sort of bill which we may adopt, is not to rely upon the discretion of the Secretary, but to furnish congressional guidelines as to how it should be done.

The Secretary apparently wants merely to be able to lay blame on the Congress for not giving him a soil bank act, so he can have an excuse on which to hereafter blame all his troubles.

The public is entitled to know these facts. It is wrong for the President of the United States to mislead the people about this soil bank situation.

I respectfully challenge the press to look up the law for itself, if the President or the Secretary of Agriculture will not tell us about it.

Read the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended—the law now in full force and effect.

Sections 1 to 6 have been on the statute books since April 27, 1935.

They give the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping powers to carry out intensive conservation efforts, including specific provisions for "changes in use of land."

The third point of the introductory section 1 says:

(3) To cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he (the Secretary) may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act.

Section 6 authorizes to be appropriated for the purposes of this act "such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary." Not even a limitation. Yet has Secretary Benson or President Eisenhower ever asked for such appropriations?

But if that is not broad enough authority—and competent counsel indicates it is—let us read further in this same act, through sections 7 and 8.



## Section 7 (a) says:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purposes of this act shall also include—

- (1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility;
- (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land;
- (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources;

and, after a fourth point on protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion, adds:

- (5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909-July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio.

Section 8 (a) of the act makes clear this authority exists in force until the end of this year.

## Section 8 (b) says:

Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, or the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); or (5) any combination of the above.

That is the law on the books. That law was there last year. It was there when this administration was supposedly desperately struggling to find a way to help the farmers. It was there when the President's message was sent to Congress. It is still on the books.

In layman's language, what does that law provide? It specifically authorizes payments to farmers for changes in land use, so as to avoid the exploitation or wasteful use of land resources for production unneeded for domestic consumption. That is what the soil-bank program will do. That is its whole purpose.

Note, however, that the language is permissive, not mandatory. I say that anyone who reads the language of the Conservation Act and the Domestic Allotment Act, with amendments up to date, going back to as early as 1935, will find in them all the authority which

is necessary for effective soil conservation or a soil conservation reserve program.

When my own soil bank bill was introduced, my purpose was to direct the Secretary to carry out such a program, in view of his failure to take such action on his own initiative. If the Secretary wanted such a program, if the President wanted such a program, why was it not included in this year's budget under authority which now exists? Why was it made into a political football?

The veto now makes the answers rather obvious. The administration was more interested in having something to propose with which to counter what Congress might develop than it was in getting a real program started.

To be sure, the existing authorization covers only this year. It would have been a simple matter to extend it, if the administration had asked for it. It has been extended numerous times before, and will likely be extended in any event this year, in order to assure the continuation of our regular agricultural program, now carried on under the act.

The act also includes a limitation of \$500 million for any one year for the sections 7 and 8 provisions; but it would be far simpler for the President and the Secretary to start an immediate program at the beginning of the year, under the existing authority, than it would be merely to ask Congress to double that amount in order to obtain the necessary funds which now appear to be required to do a creditable job.

In view of this existing authority, the President's dramatic appeal for "action" on the soil bank has a hollow ring. Why does not the administration simply ask for a supplemental appropriation, together with a request to expand the authority it now has? Is the administration afraid to do that, because it would mean admitting publicly that it has had such authority all along, and could have started the program January 1, instead of using the program as a mere political device to talk about? It is time the President answered a few of these questions. If he is too busy, or if he is away, let the Secretary of Agriculture answer them.

All the huckstering the administration's spokesmen can do will not change the simple fact that President Eisenhower, by his own decision—regardless of who may have guided it—has taken almost a \$2 billion slice out of farm income for this year.

Despite the belated gestures of the President in offering to give back pennies for the dollars he is taking away from the farmers, the fact remains that America's farmers will get about \$2,416 million less this year than would have been conservatively anticipated under the measure which the President vetoed.

This figure is not an idle guess. It is the considered judgment of competent economists who have been working on these estimates for me ever since the President vetoed the bill. It is my intention to substantiate that figure with tabulations from which it was compiled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD tabulations and statistical charts which will furnish the background for my statement that the veto has cost the American farmers not less than \$2,416 million on estimated production of this year's crops, according to the Department of Agriculture's own estimates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, would the distinguished Senator from Minnesota indicate to the Senate, so that we might know what reliance may be placed upon the charts, whether the statistics were compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, by the Treasury Department, or by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; they were not; they are tables which were developed by three members of my own staff and myself, together with representatives of the National Farmers Union, and by economists who have helped me.

One of those whose assistance I received formerly worked in the Department of Agriculture. My own administrative assistant worked for many years in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota. When Senators examine the tables in the RECORD, they will know what the background of them is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The tables reveal simple arithmetic. The Department of Agriculture has estimated the crop production for the coming year. The Department of Agriculture knew what the price support levels would have been under the Senate-House bill. The Department of Agriculture knew what the price support levels were prior to the President's veto message. The Department of Agriculture knows what the price support levels will be as announced in the President's veto message. All that is necessary is to put them down: First, the price support levels under the 1954 act, before Eisenhower gave them a little political jump; the price support levels under the conference report; the production estimates, which can be arrived at by taking the amount per pound or per bushel and multiplying it by the number of bushels or pounds under the 1954 flexible price support schedule, which was prevailing until Mr. Eisenhower spoke on television and radio Monday night. Place those figures alongside those which were provided in the bill, and we will come fairly close to the estimates.

There are other factors involved which are explained in the tables.

Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD 13 tables comparing the farm income-improving provisions of H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, which the President vetoed, with the same provisions of both the pre- and post-veto Eisenhower programs—the programs which the President originally

sent to Congress—and the makeshift program he is now offering in his veto message.

The Eisenhower preveto program was computed on the basis of the announcements of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the recommendations in President Eisenhower's 1956 message on agriculture. The postveto Eisenhower program is the program announced by the President at the time he vetoed H. R. 12. The source of the figures and the bases of calculations are shown in appropriate footnotes.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—Summary table of increased farm income improving provisions and added value of CCC stocks of H. R. 12 (Agricultural Act of 1956) compared with Eisenhower proposals

(Millions of dollars)

Provision	Reference table	Net farm income provided by H. R. 12 more than by Eisenhower programs	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Milk supports.....	II	0	\$108
Conservation reserve.....	III	\$700	510
Wheat provisions.....	IV	239	175
Cotton provisions.....	V	230	275
Peanuts.....	VI	12	17
Corn (commercial area).....	VII	768	248
Corn (noncommercial).....	VIII	127	146
Grain sorghum.....	IX	38	38
Oats.....	X	116	116
Barley.....	XI	32	32
Rye.....	XII	4	4
Hogs, cattle.....	XIII	150	150
Total.....		2,416	1,819

TABLE II.—Income from sale of milk in 1956-57

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Support price per hundredweight.....	\$3.25	\$3.25	<sup>1</sup> \$3.15
Farm marketings (billion pounds).....	108	108	108
Gross income from milk sales (million dollars).....	<sup>2</sup> \$3,510	<sup>2</sup> \$3,510	<sup>2</sup> \$3,402
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars).....	0	0	\$108

<sup>1</sup> Amended by Secretary of Agriculture.

<sup>2</sup> Understates value of total sales since all milk is valued at manufacturing milk price, whereas about 1/2 goes into fluid retail sales. However, the latter are usually governed by State or Federal milk marketing orders or regulations with formulas basing fluid milk prices on manufacturing milk market averages.

TABLE III.—Increased income from conservation reserve

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Authorized appropriations (millions of dollars).....	\$450	0	\$350
Estimated cut in production (percent) <sup>1</sup> .....	3	0	2

<sup>1</sup> Of crops not under acreage reserve.

TABLE III.—Increased income from conservation reserve—Continued

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Estimated surplus at 1955 support prices (percent) <sup>1</sup> .....	2	0	2
Additional cut in supply (percent).....	1	0	0
Price raising effect (percent).....	<sup>2</sup> 6	0	0
Production index (percent) <sup>3</sup> .....	97	0	98
Price index (percent) <sup>4</sup> .....	106	0	100
Gross income index (percent) <sup>5</sup> .....	103	0	98
Farm gross income (millions of dollars) <sup>1</sup> .....	\$8,446	\$8,196	\$8,036
Reserve payments (millions of dollars).....	\$450	0	\$350
Total gross (millions of dollars).....	\$8,896	\$8,196	\$8,386
Less than H. R. 12 (millions of dollars).....	0	\$700	\$510

<sup>1</sup> Estimate used by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in speech at Moorhead-Fargo as 1953 surplus at 1955 prices. A cut of production of this magnitude would not raise prices above deplorably low support prices; the only effect would be to stop flow of commodities to CCC. Only production cuts above this 2 percent would raise farm price above the support level.

<sup>2</sup> Based upon research results of Drs. Karl Fox and Willard W. Cochrane, professors of agricultural economics at Iowa State College and University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, respectively.

<sup>3</sup> Production without program equals 100.

<sup>4</sup> Price without program equals 100.

<sup>5</sup> Gross income without program equals 100.

TABLE IV.—Wheat

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price, per bushel.....	<sup>1</sup> \$2.51	<sup>2</sup> \$2.38	<sup>2</sup> \$2.38
Support percentage.....	90	84	76
Support price, per bushel.....	\$2.26	<sup>2</sup> \$2	\$1.81
CCC sales price percentage.....	<sup>3</sup> 105	105	<sup>4</sup> 100
Market price, per bushel.....	<sup>4</sup> \$2.39	\$2	<sup>4</sup> \$1.81
1955 production (million bushels).....	938	938	938
Cut by acreage reserve (million bushels).....	<sup>5</sup> 322	0	<sup>5</sup> 417
1956 production (million bushels).....	616	938	521
Gross income from wheat (million dollars).....	\$1,472	\$1,876	\$943
Operating expense (million dollars).....	<sup>6</sup> \$982	<sup>5</sup> \$1,250	\$628
Net income (million dollars).....	\$490	\$626	\$315
Reserve payments (million dollars).....	\$375	0	\$375
Total net income from wheatland (million dollars).....	\$865	\$626	\$690
Less than H. R. 12.....		\$239	\$175

<sup>1</sup> Old parity.

<sup>2</sup> Transitional parity.

<sup>3</sup> Announced.

<sup>4</sup> Both H. R. 12 and Eisenhower original proposal would pay wheat farmers approximately \$375 million not to grow wheat. This would cut annual production below annual market needs and thus require market to buy CCC stocks. Under the circumstances the CCC sale price sets the market price. Eisenhower initially recommended sales at market but backed down on that after thunderstorm of protests and substituted 100 percent of support price. Existing law, continued in force by H. R. 12 sets 105 percent of support as CCC minimum sale price.

<sup>5</sup> \$2.26 times 50 percent (estimated payment per bushel cut) equals \$1.13; \$375 million divided by \$1.13 equals 322 million bushels.

<sup>6</sup> \$1.81 time 50 percent equals \$0.91; \$375 million plus 91 equals 417 million bushels.

TABLE V.—Cotton

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price official grade, per pound.....	<sup>2</sup> \$0.352	\$0.348	<sup>2</sup> \$0.348
Adjustments for 3/8-inch Middling, per pound.....	<sup>4</sup> \$0.02	\$0.02	<sup>4</sup> 0
Parity price, average grade, per pound.....	<sup>4</sup> \$0.372	\$0.368	<sup>4</sup> \$0.348
Support percentage.....	90	82 1/2	81
Support price, average grade, per pound.....	\$0.337	\$0.304	\$0.282
CCC sales price percentage.....	<sup>1</sup> 105	105	<sup>1</sup> 100
Market price, average grade, per pound.....	<sup>5</sup> \$0.354	\$0.304	<sup>5</sup> \$0.282
1956 production with acreage reserve (million bales).....	13.2	13.2	13.2
Cut in production by acreage reserve (million bales).....	<sup>6</sup> 3.6	0	<sup>7</sup> 4.3
1956 production (million bales).....	9.6	13.2	8.9
Gross income from cotton sales (million dollars).....	\$1,795	\$2,006	\$1,254
Operating expenses (million dollars).....	\$1,196	\$1,337	\$930
Net income from sales (million dollars).....	\$599	\$669	\$324
Acreage reserve payment (million dollars).....	\$300	0	\$300
Total net income (million dollars).....	\$899	\$669	\$624
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars).....	0	\$230	\$275

<sup>1</sup> Offers and askings included in the "Dear George" (Aiken letter signed by Secretary Benson).

<sup>2</sup> Old parity.

<sup>3</sup> Modernized parity.

<sup>4</sup> Existing law, continued in force by H. R. 12, specifies that 3/8-inch Middling shall be the official grade for parity price and support purposes; this adds 2 cents per pound. Eisenhower recommended that repeal of this provision.

<sup>5</sup> Acreage reserve cut in production would require market to buy at CCC sales prices. Existing law, continued in force by H. R. 12, set this at not less than 105 percent support. With the market partially dependent on CCC, the CCC sales price would set market price.

<sup>6</sup> 0.337 times 500 equals \$168.50; \$168.50 divided by 2 equals \$84.25; \$300 million divided by \$84.25 equals 36 million bales.

<sup>7</sup> 282 times 500 equals \$141; 141 divided by 2 equals \$70.50; \$300 million divided by \$70.50 equals 4.3 million bales.

TABLE VI.—Peanuts

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price, per pound.....	<sup>1</sup> \$0.14	<sup>2</sup> \$0.13	<sup>2</sup> \$0.13
Support percentage.....	90	82 1/2	75
Support price.....	\$0.126	\$0.107	\$0.098
1955 production (million pounds).....	1,610	1,610	1,010
Cut by acreage reserve (million pounds).....	<sup>3</sup> 111	0	0
1956 production (million pounds).....	1,500	1,610	1,010
Gross income from peanuts (million dollars).....	\$189	\$172	\$157
Operating expenses (million dollars).....	\$126	\$114	\$104
Net income (million dollars).....	\$63	\$58	\$53
Acreage reserve payment (million dollars).....	\$7	0	0
Total net income (million dollars).....	\$70	\$58	\$53
Decrease below H. R. 12 (million dollars).....	0	\$12	\$17

<sup>1</sup> Old parity.

<sup>2</sup> Transitional parity.

<sup>3</sup> 126 divided by 2 equals \$0.063; \$7 million divided by \$0.063 equals 111 million pounds.



TABLE VII.—Corn (commercial-corn area)

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Parity price.....	<sup>1</sup> \$1.82	<sup>2</sup> \$1.73	<sup>3</sup> \$1.73
Support percentage.....	90	81	81
Support price.....	\$1.64	\$1.50	\$1.40
CCC sales price percent- age.....	105	100	100
Market price.....	<sup>4</sup> \$1.72	\$1.40	<sup>4</sup> \$1.40
1955 production (million bushels).....	2,400	2,400	2,400
Cut by acreage reserve (million bushels).....	350	0	430
1956 production (million bushels).....	2,050	<sup>4</sup> 1,800	1,970
Gross income from corn (million dollars).....	\$3,506	\$2,700	\$2,758
Operating expenses (mil- lion dollars).....	\$2,338	\$2,000	\$1,838
Net income from sales (million dollars).....	\$1,168	\$700	\$920
Acreage reserve payment (million dollars).....	\$1,300	0	\$300
Total net income (million dollars).....	\$1,468	\$700	\$1,220
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars).....		\$768	\$248

<sup>1</sup> Old parity.<sup>2</sup> Transitional parity.<sup>3</sup> Acreage reserve would cut production sufficiently that market would have to draw on CCC stocks at 105 percent of support sales price.<sup>4</sup> Acreage reserve would cut production sufficiently that market would have to draw on CCC stocks at 100 percent of support sales price.<sup>5</sup> Production estimate based on 43 million acre allotment announced by Secretary compared with 51 million acre allotment included in H. R. 12.

TABLE VIII.—Corn in noncommercial areas

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Parity price, per bushel.....	\$1.82	\$1.73	\$1.73
Support percentage.....	75	60.7	60.7
Support price, per bushel.....	<sup>1</sup> \$1.40	<sup>2</sup> \$1.12	<sup>3</sup> \$1.05
Market price.....	<sup>4</sup> \$1.64	<sup>2</sup> \$1.12	\$1.05
1955 production (millions of bushels).....	785	785	785
Cut by H. R. 12 (millions of bushels).....	<sup>5</sup> 118	0	0
1956 production (millions of bushels).....	667	785	785
Gross income from corn (millions of dollars).....	\$1,084	\$879	\$824
Operating expenses (mil- lions of dollars).....	\$722	\$586	\$550
Net income from corn sales (millions of dollars).....	\$362	\$293	\$274
Acreage reserve payments (millions of dollars).....	\$58	0	0
Total net income from corn land (millions of dollars).....	\$420	\$293	\$274
Less than H. R. 12.....		127	146

<sup>1</sup> 85 percent of 90 percent of old parity price of corn.<sup>2</sup> 75 percent of 81 percent of transitional parity price of corn.<sup>3</sup> 75 percent of \$1.50 announced in veto message.<sup>4</sup> Owing to operation of acreage reserve for commercial corn and other feed grains, noncommercial areas would become deficit areas and need to import corn thus raising local market price to at least equal the commercial area price.<sup>5</sup> 15 percent cut in acres required by law.

TABLE IX.—Grain sorghum

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Support price, per hun- dredweight.....	<sup>1</sup> \$2.18	\$1.80	<sup>2</sup> \$1.80
Market price.....	<sup>3</sup> \$2.30	\$1.80	\$1.80

TABLE IX.—Grain sorghum—Continued

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
1955 production (million bushels).....	233	233	233
Cut by H. R. 12 (million bushels).....	<sup>4</sup> 47	0	0
1956 production (million bushels).....	186	233	233
Gross from grain sorghum (million dollars).....	\$428	\$419	\$419
Operating expenses (mil- lion dollars).....	\$286	\$280	\$280
Net income from sales (million dollars).....	\$142	\$139	\$139
Acreage reserve payments (million dollars).....	\$35	0	0
Total net income (million dollars).....	\$177	\$139	\$139
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars).....	0	\$38	\$38

<sup>1</sup> 85 percent of modernized parity.<sup>2</sup> Announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.<sup>3</sup> With 15-percent cuts in feed grain production, feed grain prices will rise to competitive relation with corn.<sup>4</sup> Estimated 20 percent cut from 1955 acreage.

TABLE X.—Oats

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Support price, per bushel.....	<sup>1</sup> \$0.72	<sup>2</sup> \$0.59	<sup>3</sup> \$0.59
Market price, per bushel.....	<sup>4</sup> \$0.80	\$0.59	\$0.59
1955 production (million bushels).....	1,576	1,576	1,576
Cut required by H. R. 12 (million bushels).....	<sup>5</sup> 236	0	0
1956 production (million bushels).....	1,340	1,576	1,576
Gross from oats (million dollars).....	\$1,072	\$930	\$930
Operating expenses (mil- lion dollars).....	\$714	\$620	\$620
Net income from sales (million dollars).....	\$358	\$310	\$310
Acreage reserve payments (million dollars).....	\$58	0	0
Total net income.....	\$416	\$310	\$310
Less than H. R. 12.....	0	116	116

<sup>1</sup> 85 percent of modernized parity.<sup>2</sup> Announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.<sup>3</sup> Owing to cut in feed grain production market prices would be competitive with corn at 90 percent of parity.<sup>4</sup> 15 percent cut in acreage.

TABLE XI.—Barley

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Support price, per bushel.....	<sup>1</sup> \$1.13	<sup>2</sup> \$0.93	<sup>3</sup> \$0.93
Market price, per bushel.....	<sup>4</sup> \$1.24	\$0.93	\$0.93
1955 production, million bushels.....	391	391	391
Cut required by H. R. 12, million bushels.....	<sup>5</sup> 59	0	0
1956 production, million bushels.....	332	391	391
Gross from barley, million dollars.....	\$412	\$364	\$364
Operating expenses, mil- lion dollars.....	\$288	\$242	\$242
Net income from sales, million dollars.....	\$124	\$122	\$122
Acreage reserve payment, million dollars.....	\$30	0	0
Total net income, million dollars.....	\$154	\$122	\$122
Less than H. R. 12, million dollars.....	0	\$32	\$32

<sup>1</sup> 85 percent of modernized parity.<sup>2</sup> Announced by Secretary of Agriculture.<sup>3</sup> Competitive with corn level in view of acreage cuts in feed grains.<sup>4</sup> 15-percent cut in acreage.

TABLE XII.—Rye

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Support price, per bushel.....	<sup>1</sup> \$1.41	<sup>2</sup> \$1.16	<sup>3</sup> \$1.16
Market price, per bushel.....	<sup>4</sup> \$1.50	\$1.16	\$1.16
1955 production, million bushels.....	29	29	29
Cut required by H. R. 12, million bushels.....	<sup>5</sup> 4	0	0
1956 production, million bushels.....	25	29	29
Gross from rye, million dollars.....	\$38	\$34	\$34
Operating expenses, mil- lion dollars.....	\$13	\$11	\$11
Net from sales, million dol- lars.....	\$25	\$23	\$23
Acreage reserve payment, million dollars.....	\$2	0	0
Total net income, million dollars.....	\$27	\$23	\$23
Less than H. R. 12, million dollars.....	\$0	\$4	\$4

<sup>1</sup> 85 percent of modernized parity.<sup>2</sup> Announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.<sup>3</sup> Competitive market with wheat and corn whose acreage is deeply cut by acreage reserve.<sup>4</sup> 15-percent cut required by H. R. 12.TABLE XIII.—Hogs, cattle, and other  
perishables<sup>1</sup>

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto an- nounce- ment	Original pro- posal
Added sec. 32 funds (mil- lion dollars).....	\$500	0	0
Farmers share (percent) <sup>2</sup> .....	30	30	30
Increased hog and cattle, gross (million dollars).....	\$150	0	0
Less than H. R. 12 (mil- lion dollars).....	0	\$150	\$150

<sup>1</sup> This table relates only to the direct price support purchases of meat products from the \$500 million increase provided by H. R. 12 in appropriation for sec. 32 funds. It takes no account of the income-improving effect upon livestock producers of a reduction in supply and increase in price of feed grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I cannot help digressing to say that it somewhat amuses me when I recall that the administration prides itself on its businesslike efficiency. The administration really has made considerable political capital from its alleged businesslike efficiency. This would lead one to believe that when the administration prepares statistics, when it makes analyses of economic matters, it comes up with prompt answers which are efficient and accurate.

Yet, I must say again that I would like to have an explanation from the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the new economic factors which they have found between last Friday, when the Department closed its doors for the weekend, or since last Saturday, if the Department worked on Saturday, and Monday, when the President issued his veto message; because the price of one commodity after another was lifted overnight under support levels by the sheer announcement of the President, who says he believes in a free economy, in the law of supply and demand; who says he is efficient and that his administration is efficient.

I repeat: Either the Secretary of Agriculture did not know what he was doing last week, and therefore should be dismissed this week; or, if the Secretary knew what he was doing last week, and had honest answers, under the 1954 Act and the criteria established therein, to questions relating to the establishment of price support levels, there is only one other explanation, namely, that the President must have picked figures out of the air to justify his veto, and to pump money back into the economy quickly, without any legislative power or directive.

Furthermore, the advance-payment idea is one of the most unusual programs of which I have ever heard. It is a program of advance payments for something that has not even, as yet, been agreed to by the farmers who will participate.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in reply to the Senator from California, the able minority leader, that the sources of the figures are to be found, for example, in the reports of the Agricultural Marketing Service, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the indexes reports received by the Congress; and also, for example, based on results of research by Dr. Karl Fox and Dr. Willard W. Cochran, professors of agricultural economics at Iowa State College and University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, respectively.

Mr. President, I have completed my remarks, with the exception of yielding for the purpose of questions.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desired to ask the Senator a question based on the President's veto message, which reads, in part:

Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income.

In his veto message and in his speech following the message the President recommended that Congress enact quickly a soil-bank program, nothing else.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the Senator this question. As a matter of fact, does the soil-bank program, standing alone, increase net income? Rather, does it not depress the income?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At best, it is replacement income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At best.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At best, it is replacement income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But even for it to be replacement income, we must assume the farmer will get out of participation in the program as much as he would have gotten out of tilling the same number of acres. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is one other factor, namely, that if the soil-bank program could be widely enough adopted, and sufficient acreage could be cut back at one time so that the amount of land in production could be limited, it would have the indirect effect of lifting prices.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the program has to be projected one crop ahead, in

order to accomplish that purpose. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the immediate result is not to increase net income. Is not that a strong argument in favor of many of the other provisions which were carried in the bill the President vetoed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say "Yes." The Senator from Florida and the Senator from New Mexico, who are now present, both advanced arguments for the compulsory type of soil bank, namely, that if farmers were to partake of the benefits, they would have to participate in the soil-bank proposal. I say to them that the administration did not want a compulsory program. It wanted a voluntary program. It said the incentive payments would be big enough to get farmers to come into the program. So the Anderson-Holland proposal was not accepted in committee. It was accepted on the floor, after Senators heard debate about it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it was modified in conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may have been misguided, although I think not; but as an individual and as one Senator, I submit that one reason why I voted for higher supports, with soil-bank provisions, was that the benefit payments for soil-bank participation were to be at 50 percent of the support level. When support levels are decreased, the total payments are decreased. If there were to be a soil bank program on a voluntary principle—and it is highly debatable whether that is desirable, but that is what the administration wished—with incentives or benefits, then the benefits would have to be increased, and the only way the benefits could be increased, under the administration's own proposal, would be to get the prices up. I say that theory and the logic behind it can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that there was a bit of hypocrisy involved, because if lower price supports are going to be received, lower benefits are going to be received, and if benefits of soil-bank participation are lowered, participation will be lowered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And net income will be lowered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If one were really for the Anderson-Holland proposal, then he ought to be for higher supports to encourage soil-bank participation, because that is the only way it would work.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been following with interest and appreciation the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I want to bring him good news and cheerful news in at least one respect, namely, that the soil bank bill today introduced by the Senator from Florida for himself, the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Mississippi, does contain the compulsory features. I understand some Senators on the other side of the aisle have joined us, whom we are happy to have associated with us. The Senator from Florida

is glad to hear that the Senator from Minnesota now favors that feature.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said I thought it had considerable merit, and I am prone to support it if the administration can be kept from recommending it, which I say because I have found the administration's recommendations to be completely unreliable. If the Senator can present it on his own, perhaps he will get my support.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry the Senator says only that he is coming to the point where he is almost persuaded. I hope before long he will be completely persuaded and will join us. I want to assure him there is a place on the team for him. We shall need his help in pulling the wagon. We shall welcome his signature on the bill, if he desires to join in sponsoring it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. The proposal reminds me—not this particular proposal, but as it is related to the total farm program—of one who was invited to participate in a canoe trip, but then was told, "We are short of canoes, but we have peanut shucks." We cannot sail in what the Senator suggests. It is a tidbit of the total program.

As one who has learned the hard way that one does not always get what he wants, or should get, or needs, perhaps we shall have to do the best we can to satisfy the immediate needs of the farmers, the very limited needs, not all of them. If the President is really so anxious—and I gather there is a frenzy of activity in the White House and they can hardly wait to get out of town—if they really want to do something, there is already a law on the books to authorize them to start a soil-bank program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to go further and commend the distinguished Senator for having himself introduced a soil-bank bill last year, but I regret to say there were no compulsory features in the bill. I hope he will reconsider his position and join us in supporting the compulsory features. I think the distinguished Senator last year recognized what others of us have recognized this year, that the preferred way to approach the problem, big as it was, which involved \$1,200,000,000 a year, was to ask for authorization from Congress for this particular effort.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have actually a chance to pass on a budget in acting on appropriations. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, of which I happen to be a member, is now sitting. If the Senator has a program for a \$1,200,000,000 program which he would like to add to the budget, that avenue is open to him. It was open to him last year. I think the Senator was showing his good sense when he approached the matter last year by offering an authorization bill. I am sorry the bill was not considered or approved then, with any changes that may have been made, including the feature of compulsion, as to which I hope the Senator will join us.



The point I bring to the Senator's attention is that this administration has submitted to the Congress, as every administration must under the law, a budget showing what amount is expected to be spent under the legislation which is now on the books, to which the distinguished Senator has referred, and that we have from year to year—including last year, and also including this year, by means of action already taken at the other end of the Capitol—approved those budgets rather closely. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and all the others of us must realize that before entering into a program involving additional expenditures—expenditures six times as large as the normal expenditures for the program which now is on the statute books—it was wise and it was good government for the administration to seek legislative approval, and that it would have been regarded as almost utter folly for this administration or the preceding one or any other administration to seek to proceed with such a program without obtaining legislative approval of it, particularly when so many of the features of the program were additions to existing law—as, for instance, the features of the acreage reserve program in the soil bank, which involves making payments by way of inducement.

Upon a careful reading of the bill now on the statute books, I have not been able to find in it any provisions which would have justified action on the part of executive officers, without prior approval by the Congress, in paying out more than the product involved was worth, in order to get farmers to agree to abandon production for 1 year on their particular land; and I think the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that there are in the measure which Congress passed, in the case of the soil-bank program, features which not only greatly transcend in amount, but also greatly transcend in their details and in respect to some of the objectives sought to be carried out, those embraced in the present law. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree with those statements?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not fully, I say most kindly.

First, I wish to say that under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, there is authority to engage in a much larger soil conservation program than the one the administration is engaging in at the present time. I believe that under sections 7 and 8 of that act there is a \$5 million authorization. So the administration could have requested an expanded authorization. The smart lawyers in the executive departments should know what the present authorization is. The departments have large staffs of so-called experts who should be familiar with those details.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Florida to wait a moment, please.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let me say that insofar as the soil-conservation program is concerned, if I am not mistaken the Appropriations Committee from time to time, at the request of the Department of Agriculture—and after holding hearings for the purpose, and obtaining testimony from the Department of Agriculture—has included in the appropriation bills, even though such provisions may have amounted to legislative language, all kinds of directions regarding the use of funds. Let me say most respectfully to the Senator from Florida that if the Secretary of Agriculture believes that this matter is so urgent and that time is wasting—and let me point out that we shall not be able to report such a bill in several days—at least at long last the Department of Agriculture knows a little about soil conservation and the soil-bank program. Apparently the Department did not know anything about them on January 12, because I have read from the testimony given before our committee, where both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Under Secretary of Agriculture said they were unprepared with the details of such a program. But now they are prepared with the details; and I say that many of those details can be worked out under existing law. I say, further, that the Department of Agriculture is considering the matter right now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that the Department of Agriculture has within it some able men. But I am not willing to admit that the Department has any able men than the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] or many other Members of this body. I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that last year, when he thought some provision should be made for this program, he did not request that such a provision be handled by the Appropriations Committee—and I think he was wise in taking that position—and he did not offer on the floor of the Senate an amendment to achieve soil-bank legislation by way of indirection—and I think he was wise in that decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But let me say I supported other appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the Senator from Minnesota had not attempted to proceed by indirection in this instance.

Inasmuch as I should now be in attendance at the committee session, I must make my remarks rather brief; but I wish to say that I believe the approach adopted by the Senator from Minnesota, in proposing specific legislation, was the wise and the only proper one, in view of the large size of the program and the fact that it called for a departure from existing programs. I would not agree that by means of setting up a committee and later by means of action taken at the suggestion of the Appropriations Committee, a program involving \$1,-

200,000,000 and covering many details which certainly are not covered by existing law, should have been initiated.

I think the best way the Senator from Minnesota can accomplish his purpose is for him to jump right in with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Florida, and other Senators who now are supporting proposed soil-bank legislation by itself, and to help to have it passed by the Congress speedily and sent to the President for his signature. So I extend the warmest possible invitation to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, to join in that effort.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I realize the warmth of the invitation, and I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by saying that, first, I introduced the soil-bank bill because I felt that it was essential to have permanent, mandatory legislation on that subject.

I am frank to say that as a Member of the Senate I myself did not fully appreciate the significance of all the language in the act of 1935, as amended, as regards conservation and what we term the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I do not profess to be a lawyer or an expert on agricultural law; but I say that the Department of Agriculture is simply loaded with such lawyers and experts, who supposedly know what is in the law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, my argument is that at first this administration was opposed to a soil bank, but suddenly the administration got a passion for it, when it felt the soil bank was popular. And now the administration has a super-passion for the soil bank, when it thinks it can cause trouble for others by taking that position.

I repeat, that under the existing act of 1935, as amended, there already is authority for the administration's soil-bank proposal, or at least authority for many phases of it. Under existing law, the administration could have doubled the payments proposed to be made to farmers for taking crops out of production. Specific language on that point is to be found in the existing law. But the administration, which had complained about the soil bank when it was proposed by others, did not even know that under existing law there was already authority for the establishment of a soil bank. Furthermore, when others proposed the creation of a soil bank, by means of appropriate legislation, the administration said, "No," and said that a soil bank would be too expensive. At that time the administration thought it would cost \$400 million to establish a soil bank, and at that time the administration thought a soil bank would be too expensive.

Now the administration says that \$1,-200,000,000 is needed for a soil bank, and that such a soil bank will not be too expensive. Instead of being too expensive, Mr. President, the administration now wants \$1,200,000,000 made available at once for a soil bank. In fact, Mr. President, the administration wants to get a soil-bank program into operation so quickly that it is willing to send out checks for payments in connection with

the soil bank before anyone agrees to participate in the soil bank. That would be exactly like having an insurance company make payments on an accident insurance policy before the policy was taken out, or before an accident occurred. An insurance company which attempted to operate on that basis would not be in business very long, Mr. President. I have never heard of so ridiculous a proposal.

This administration is supposed to have financial and fiscal responsibility; but this proposal by it is the epitome of irresponsibility. This administration says it has "bold, new programs;" but it did not even know what was included in the old program, much less in the new one. The administration is like the man on the flying trapeze: It flies through the air with the greatest of ease, and then purloins someone else's proposals.

In 1954 the administration made use of surplus set-asides, even though previously it had objected to them; when they were called for in a bill which previously was before the Congress, the administration opposed them bitterly. In short, when anyone else advocated them, the administration branded the attempt as "economic opportunism."

Mr. President, I am sick and tired of such attitudes on the part of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. I am sick and tired of having statistics misused by the President and his Secretary of Agriculture. I say they did not understand what was in the farm bill the President vetoed; and they have not been willing to work with the Congress on an effective program. Instead, they balk and drag their feet and refuse and become stubborn. Today we find that the very proposals which they proclaim as the salvation of the economy are the same as proposals which 5 months ago they denounced—the very proposals with respect to which they had no details to offer as late as the middle of January 1956. This is politics at its best—or worst. Look at it either way. At best, it is shabby politics. The farmers will see through it. They will ask questions. The wheat farmers are going to ask, "Why was the price support level 76 percent of parity in the first 2 weeks of April, but 84 percent afterward?" Why did the dairy farmer receive less for his milk just a few days ago than he will receive in line with the President's announcement in the veto message?

Perhaps we have done some good in the Senate by this fight. Perhaps, at long last, we have aroused the President to a realization that he made some commitments in his campaign in 1952. Perhaps, at long last, we have aroused Mr. Benson to understand that there is trouble in rural America. Perhaps, at long last, he realizes that a price of \$3.15 a hundred for milk is unfair. Perhaps, at long last, he will understand that \$1.81 for wheat under price supports is unfair. Perhaps he will realize that he cannot play footloose and fancy free in the Senate, "wheeling and dealing" on corn, cotton, and other crops.

Consider the announcement of the President of \$1.50 a bushel for corn in commercial areas, with an acreage allot-

ment of 43 million acres. If the President does not know that that is unworkable, someone should inform him. According to the testimony, with 49 million allotted acres of corn, there was very limited compliance with the program, and very limited participation.

Fifty-one million acres was the recommendation of many of the administration's own statisticians. Now they are to have an acreage allotment of 43 million acres, with a price of \$1.50 a bushel in the commercial corn area, with the remainder at a price ranging from about \$1.25 to \$1.28. This Senator, who comes from a State which produces a great abundance of agricultural commodities, makes the statement at this time that the price of corn in the Midwest will be from \$1.25 to \$1.28. The farmer will find out about the price. The program advanced by the administration is not only unworkable; it is uneconomic and unjustifiable.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, 84th Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed himself, Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 21st day of January 1957, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 12) to provide an improved farm program, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and it was resolved that the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

#### REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY—IV— A CONSTRUCTIVE POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last January I began a series of discussions in the Senate on various aspects of the international situation. I have since outlined the issues, as I understand the issues, which confront us in southeast Asia and in the north African crisis.

When I began these discussions last January, I stated:

If the national interest requires us to rise above political considerations in matters of foreign policy, it also requires us to undertake a vigorous review of that policy. It requires us to make an unrelenting search for facts and ideas which may guide us in dealing with difficulties abroad.

It is in that spirit that I address the Senate.

The need for constant Senate review of policy is nowhere more clearly evident today than in connection with the Middle East. There is universal recognition of the real and imminent danger of war in that part of the world. Skirmishes are taking place along the borders of Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, and even air duels have been fought.

The President and the Secretary of State have repeatedly made clear the deep concern of the United States over these trends toward all-out conflict. Additional marines and a division of destroyers have been sent to the Mediterranean, and elements of the United States 6th Fleet are even now patrolling off Israeli and Arab ports.

I do not question either the concern or the actions of the executive branch in this matter. What disturbs me, however, is that they relate to a situation the significance of which is little understood in this country. Yet the need for public understanding is very great. It is even more; it is absolutely essential, if there is to be public acceptance and support of policies which will serve the totality of American interests in the Middle East.

When we speak of the Middle East, we are speaking of one of the decisive political regions of the world. It ranks among the great crossroads of the earth, providing passage by land, sea, and air between Europe, Asia, and Africa. Today the Middle East is emerging from a sweeping political transition. At the close of World War I, the region was transferred from Turkish authority into the hands of Great Britain and France. In turn, European political control, weakened by World War II, has now virtually disappeared. Where that control has not been withdrawn willingly, it has been forced out by the rising tides of militant nationalism and popular unrest.

France has gone completely from the area. British power remains at Cyprus in the eastern Mediterranean. The British also maintain a tenuous foothold in Aden, at the base of the Arabian Peninsula, and in a group of small sheikdoms along the Persian Gulf.

In place of European domination in the Middle East, there have emerged a number of independent states. These include the Jewish homeland of Israel and the Arab countries of Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia. On the political spectrum, the new states range from western-type democracy to absolute monarchy.

There is great wealth for a few in the Middle East. For the many, however, life is a grim struggle against natural and manmade elements for the barest subsistence. The wealth comes from inequitable economic systems. It also comes from petroleum; much of the region floats on a sea of oil containing perhaps two-thirds of the world's resources in this vital source of power. The Western companies drill it and pay enormous royalties for the privilege, only a trickle of which filters down to the impoverished people.

Mr. President, a far-reaching political transition in a setting of this kind can



hardly take place without shock and dislocation. The lid of external restraint cannot be removed from over 40 million diverse people without a dangerous boiling over of the ambitions, the angers, the fears, and the rivalries which the lid has long held submerged.

It is not surprising, then, that the threat of full-scale conflict between Israel and the Arab States hangs over the Middle East. It is not surprising that a bitter antiwesternism seethes through much of the region. It is not surprising that obscure rivalries pulsate beneath the apparent unity of the Arab States as they vie with one another for leadership. It is not surprising that the restless millions throughout the area can be led to strike out first in one direction and then in another in their blind and incomprehending fury against the burden of poverty and exploitation which they have carried for so long.

We cannot stop these churning forces in the Middle East. But what this country does or does not do will have a profound impact on the situation in the Middle East. Our policies will either ease or intensify the present tensions. Our policies will either contribute to the impending explosion or act to prevent it.

It seems to me, however, that before we do anything we need to have clearly in mind what our interests are in that area. Only on that basis can we hope to build an intelligible and acceptable policy, a constructive policy for the American people to pursue.

Our direct economic interests in the Middle East are substantial. American business holds petroleum concessions of great potential value in that area. Americans have invested more than a billion dollars in these undertakings. The air and sea routes which pass through the region are also of considerable importance to our commerce.

In the event of war, access to these routes and even to land passages in the Middle East would be of great significance. It is conceivable, too, that our airbase concession at Dhahran in Saudi Arabia might also be useful in wartime. We should bear in mind, however, that the utility of that base is already sharply restricted by the Government of Saudi Arabia and there is no assurance that the concession which expires shortly will be continued.

The United States also has a human interest in the Middle Eastern people. It has been expressed in our contribution to the U. N. relief program for the Arab refugees. It has been expressed in assistance of various kinds to the Arab States and to Israel totaling half a billion dollars.

The human interest of the United States in the Middle East extends to both Arabs and Israelis. In the case of the Arabs it goes back many decades to the work of religious and educational foundations which have long been active in the region. These early influences still permeate the policies of this country.

With respect to the Israelis, our concern is of more recent origin, but it is nonetheless important. This country supported the re-creation of a Jewish homeland in the Middle East. We were

the first to recognize the new State of Israel in 1948.

On April 16, only a few days ago, Israel celebrated its eighth anniversary as a free and democratic nation.

It has sometimes been said that we have favored in our policies Arab over Jew, or Jew over Arab. We may well have differentiated at times between governments which we believed were working toward peace or against peace in the Middle East, and I hope that we shall continue to do so. That differentiation should not apply, however, to the common people of the Middle East; they are all—Arab and Jew alike—caught up in the same gathering web of tragedy.

We have not become so callous to the brutality of this era of history that we are indifferent to the threatened religious war in the Middle East. We will not acquiesce, nor will decent mankind acquiesce, in the senseless slaughter of thousands of innocent people whether they be Jews or Arabs.

If I may sum up, then, our interests in the Middle East are of considerable extent and importance. They are not in themselves, however, sufficient to explain the deep concern of the United States in this region. They do not begin to measure the full scope of the importance of the Middle East to this country.

There are other interests, derivative interests, but nonetheless real and vital interests. For years now, the United States has been closely linked with other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Far from being a burden as some have contended, these ties have kept the cost of the national defense of the United States within the bounds of the possible. I go further. In my opinion these ties have forestalled the outbreak of world war III.

During the last year, however, the cement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has steadily crumbled. NATO has shown signs of decline. It may well be that it is disintegrating faster than the threat which brought it into being is subsiding. That such is the case is clearly evident in the recent request of Iceland that we withdraw our forces from the island. It is evident in the recent withdrawal of all of France's NATO divisions from Europe to North Africa. It is evident in the growing antagonism between Greece and Turkey. It is evident in the inability to find a satisfactory solution to the Cyprus question. It is evident in the testimony of Admiral Radford before the Foreign Affairs Committee a few days ago, and it is evident in the testimony of General Bradley before the Symington committee. I wonder if it is evident downtown, though, when the President, at a press conference a few weeks ago, stated that in his opinion NATO was in the best shape ever, or words to that effect.

Let me make it clear, Mr. President, that I am not suggesting by these observations that NATO or any commitment or policy of this country should be clothed in an inflexibility which admits of no alteration. We must always be prepared to make changes to meet changing circumstances. What disturbs me, however, is the erosion of NATO. The organization has not changed very

much outwardly, but I believe it has nevertheless changed in the sense that it has lost its spirit, its drive, and its leadership.

If that is already the case, then what further damage will be done to the organization by the crisis in the Middle East? Could this pillar of peace hold together in the event of a war, even a local war, in that area? What would be the effect of such a war on the unresolved problems of the eastern wing of NATO, on Greece, Turkey, and Britain?

And what would be the impact of violence and chaos in the Middle East on the Western European members? Only recently recovered from World War II, they would face the loss of petroleum sources in the Middle East on which their present economic stability heavily depends. Would they not be catapulted into a serious rivalry among themselves which would make a mockery of European unity? It is not without significance in this connection that recent Russian trade overtures to Western Europe have contained hints of growing sources of petroleum for export in the Soviet bloc.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point. I believe it is clear what a conflict in the Middle East would do to NATO. It would tear it apart.

Nor would the difficulties end at that point. Old and new forms of totalitarianism would stalk the ruins of war in the Middle East. They would look beyond the Arab world. Opening before the eyes of would-be conquerors would be the vast Moslem community which extends from the Atlantic coast of North Africa through central and southern Asia as far as Indonesia and the southern Philippines in the Pacific, a community of 800 million people. Could we stand by idly in these circumstances? Could others?

The problem which confronts us in the Middle East, then, is greater than the saving of American oil concessions, routes of passage, or air bases, however important any or all of these may be. It is greater than human sympathy for Arabs or Jews, however deeply and sincerely we may feel that sympathy. The real dimension of the problem in the last analysis is the preservation of the foundations of world peace with all that implies for us and other nations in a nuclear age.

The simple fact appears to be that we cannot afford to permit a major conflict to take place in the Middle East. The Western European nations cannot afford it. In the last analysis, it is even possible that the Russians cannot afford it.

It is one thing for them to play the ancient game of arms-traffic diplomacy, when the danger of self-entrapment is remote. It is another when the game threatens to touch off fires beyond control, fires which may spread and fuse into a worldwide conflagration from which the Soviet Union along with others will find no escape.

That moment may be fast approaching. The time to curb the fires may be soon or never. I do not know what course the Russian will now take. One can only hope that they will see the danger, as others have seen it, in the

political merchandising of armaments in the Middle East. It is to be hoped that, in view of their statement released yesterday, they too see this danger and its implication for them.

Regardless of what the Russians do or do not do, however, it seems to me that it is essential for this country to have a clear understanding of where we ourselves are headed in the Middle East. It is essential that we have a constructive policy which will enable us to get there.

Neither a clear understanding nor a constructive policy is possible without an answer to a fundamental question. I cannot answer it. Other Senators cannot answer it. The Congress cannot answer it. The American people individually cannot answer it. Only the President, on behalf of all the people, can answer it.

The question is basic. It is simply this: Is the preservation of peace in the Middle East of vital importance to the interests of the United States?

I have tried to indicate some of the factors which must go into the answer. Others have done the same. The President alone, however, is in the position to lead in this matter. He alone can weigh all the factors.

Because this question has yet to be answered, clearly and unequivocally, our policies have faltered in the Middle East. We have dabbled in Cyprus while seeking to placate all sides. We have gingerly touched the edges of the Baghdad Pact. We have preached generalities on peace to Arab and Israeli while the war clouds have gathered. We have come close to a servile appeasement of arrogance in at least one instance in our desire to preserve peace. We have called on the United Nations for action but have not defined what we mean by action.

Time is running short to alter the dangerous and futile indecision which has plagued our Middle Eastern policies. I believe the trend toward war in the Middle East can still be halted. It can be halted only if there is a clear understanding of what must be done to preserve peace in that region, and only if there is the courage and the leadership to do it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Montana willing to yield for a question, or would he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's train of thought; but in his last observations he seemed to be very much disturbed about the situation in the Middle East. However, it is my impression that the Secretary of State believes that conditions are much better in the Middle East than they were 2 years ago, and he so stated to the Committee on Foreign Relations a short time ago. There seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether conditions now are serious.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall the instance brought to mind by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas; but I suggest that perhaps a lot of water has gone over the dam in the past month or so, and that conditions in the Middle East may have changed for the worse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think conditions have changed so much for the worse, or was the Secretary's statement that matters have improved greatly in that area in the past year a sound judgment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Arkansas knows my position. I have not agreed with the Secretary of State that world conditions were looking rosier. As a matter of fact, it has been my long-held opinion that in the last year conditions have become steadily worse, not only in the Middle East, but all over the world, as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said, on page 9 of his statement:

We have gingerly touched the edges of the Baghdad pact.

It was my understanding that the Secretary of State was one of the prime movers in the origin of the Baghdad Pact. Is not that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was my understanding, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have done a great deal more than to touch it gingerly; we have really promoted it, although we have not joined it. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, is it not a very serious matter that dominating our whole policy in the Middle East and in southeast Asia has been the emphasis upon military assistance, beginning with the Pakistan assistance, and continuing through the SEATO organization and the Baghdad Pact?

I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe the present administration is placing entirely too much emphasis upon purely military affairs, and too little on political and economic considerations in that area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have felt for a long time that the policy of containment—a Democratic policy in its origin—has perhaps outlived its usefulness, and has become a sort of diplomatic Maginot Line. However, that policy has been followed, and its strength is based upon the defensive military aspect.

In the creation, under the Baghdad Pact, of the so-called northern tier of nations, we find Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain allied together; and we find the United States, one of the countries most responsible for the pact, staying outside and showing no indication of joining. So far as I am concerned, I believe the United States should not join the Baghdad Pact, although I note, according to the press, that Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson, who is at present in either Baghdad or Teheran—I forget which—while representing the United States at a Baghdad pact meeting, assured the members of the pact that this country was willing to give additional economic assistance, but indicated that the United States is not interested, at this time, at least, in joining the pact itself. Secretary Henderson is, incidentally, one of our best diplomats and is an expert on middle eastern affairs. Secretary Dulles is to be commended for making good use of the services of this outstanding man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not delay the Senator further, except to congratulate and encourage him upon this kind of discussion, which is a part of the series he has carried on.

I interpreted his remarks of a moment ago as a plea to the President to exert some leadership in the formulation of a policy in the area of the Middle East. I certainly wish to encourage the Senator from Montana in his efforts to do that.

Under our system of government, it is virtually impossible for the Senate to initiate foreign policy. We have neither the machinery nor the access to the information which comes daily from all over the world; but we are interested in foreign policy. I think the Senator is performing a valuable service in urging the administration to consider seriously the situation in the Middle East and to develop policies which have some greater relationship to the realities in that area, rather than to try to deceive us into believing that everything is rosy, that the Russian policy is collapsing, and that we are about to prevail in all the areas of the Middle East.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator from Arkansas has said. I look upon him as one of the great statesmen of our time. Certainly he is a keen student of international affairs, not only in the Middle East, but in other parts of the world, as well.

The purpose of my speech today, as has been the purpose of the previous three speeches, is to point out the difficulties, but at the same time to try to be constructive, so that in the field of foreign policy the administration and Congress together can seek ways and means to overcome the tremendous difficulties which confront this country and the rest of the free world at present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana is a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was delighted when he was added to the committee in recent years. He has performed useful service on the committee. The Senator approaches problems of foreign policy with fairness, and he has made a very fine contribution to our foreign policy. He has visited the Far East, and was one of the representatives of the United States, together with the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], during the negotiation of one of the pacts.

But I would not want the record to stand as it does with respect to a statement which was made by the Senator, and I believe the question should be raised. On page 9 of his statement, the Senator from Montana said:

The question is basic. It is simply this: Is the preservation of peace in the Middle East of vital importance to the interests of the United States?

As the Senator will recall, that statement deals with a question which only the President of the United States can answer. I believe it has been answered by the President. I believe the leadership in both Houses of Congress, the



chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the ranking minority member of that committee, and the Committee on Foreign Relations as a whole, have been informed of developments in the area of the world called the Middle East.

I think the policies which the Government of the United States has followed have basically been aimed at preserving the peace of the world not only in the Middle East, but in other sections of the globe as well.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that, as one of the charter members of the United Nations, I think the Government of the United States took a very constructive stand and assumed leadership in the adoption by the Security Council of the resolution, which was at first objected to by the representatives of the Soviet Union, which provided for the visit of Mr. Hammarskjöld to the Middle East. He is now there. Consultations have been going on. I do not believe the Secretary of State has ever argued, at least he has never done so in my presence, either in a public meeting or a private meeting, that there were not difficulties in that area of the world, or that there were not tensions or dangers there.

I think the policies our Government has followed, in operating through the United Nations, a charter member of which we, as well as other powers, happen to be, in urging that organization to use its good offices as well as the good offices of the Government of the United States, have been good policies. Certainly the implication should not be left that that matter has not had very close attention, and that the Government of the United States, exercising its foreign policy through the President and the Secretary of State, has not been mindful of the problems which confront the peace of the world, as well as of the countries which may be immediately involved.

I may say it is one thing to raise the issues, and I think they should be raised; it is quite another thing to find the ideal solution of the problem. As the Senator has quite properly pointed out, the countries in that area of the world were for a long time under the domination of one power or another. There is a restlessness all over the world. In my judgment, colonialism is dead, and I do not believe a policy based on colonialism can, in the long run, be a success. I believe that has been demonstrated in the Far East. I think it will be demonstrated in North Africa.

But I wish to say to the Senator that I do not believe, and I do not think the Senator from Montana believes, that we have a right unilaterally to go into the Middle East and impose our will on the countries of that area, and attempt to lay down a dictum which would require other nations to conform to our views on what might be the thinking at the moment, either in the Government of the United States, or among 1 or 2 other powers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can find very little fault with what the distinguished minority leader has just said. I believe he is raising questions which perhaps he would not suggest if he listened to my speech to its conclusion.

I wish to have it clearly understood that, so far as I am concerned, I am not discussing foreign policy because of any political intent. I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and I shall certainly see that that is done; but at the same time I believe certain issues should be raised, certain difficulties should be pointed out. If possible, we may, together, be able to offer some suggestions. I shall do what I can to help the administration in the field of foreign policy, and I know that is the attitude of the Democratic Party as well.

We recognize the dangers inherent in a biased foreign policy. We recognize that in this particular field we are in it together, win or lose, and we hope to act accordingly. If I may continue with my speech, I think the answers to the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader will become evident.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to developing a foreign policy, I have made it quite clear heretofore that I think this administration goes much too far in its reliance on purely military means to contain the expansion of Russia, or, to put it in another way, to prevent the outbreak of war in the area we have been discussing.

The Pakistan arms agreement did not have to be brought before the Senate, but we were advised of it. At that time I stated my views on the floor of the Senate. I still feel the same way about our foreign aid programs. When the administration is asking for \$4,900 million for military hardware or direct military support, it is a great mistake; there is a mistaken reliance on force.

I think the purpose of a discussion, insofar as we can perform any service, is at least to give voice to our views. If officials of the administration do not care to give heed to those views, that is their business. But I still think the Senator's discussion and our questions are realistic. They are not political in motivation. They are intended, so far as I am concerned, to persuade the administration to give a little more attention to the nonmilitary aspects of our foreign policy, specifically economic assistance, and, also specifically, cultural activities in this field, which I think would be much more likely to influence the political management and political relations of the Middle East with the West, ourselves and our Western allies, than would purely military aid. We have tried military measures, and in my opinion, they have failed. As a matter of fact, this administration, some 2 or 3 years ago, offered aid to Pakistan in creating the Northern Tier. Now it is a failure, and we run to the United Nations and ask their help. I approve of that. But we contributed to that condition. I think the situation is the outgrowth of historical activities. We have failed to meet the situation with the proper methods.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have failed, up to now, to come up with the right policy. I do not have the answer, but I hope that, with our collective thinking, we may give the administration some suggestions

which will help them, in the interest of peace in that area of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has expressed my view much better than I could present it. The point I am trying to make is that there are other methods than purely military measures to be considered, and I hope some attention will be given to them. I cannot overlook the fact that for the first time since it was started, budget requests for the exchange program have been cut. That is an example of failure of those shaping our foreign policy to realize other aspects of our relations.

At the same time, the administration is proposing enormous increases in purely military assistance. That is the point I am trying to make. It is not done from any political motivation. I do not think the administration should be so sensitive to every criticism in Congress as being motivated by political considerations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, as the Senator knows, increasing military expenditures is the easiest way to get things done, but it is not necessarily the best way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I apologize for taking more of the Senator's time, but I shall leave the floor, and may not have an opportunity to make the statement I have in mind.

I wish to compliment and commend the able Senator from Montana for his very scholarly discussion of the most vexing problem engaging his attention. His is a very fine presentation. I have read the Senator's speech in its entirety.

I may be getting a little ahead of the Senator in the presentation of his address, but there is one matter he touches upon which perhaps may not have received the attention of the public generally which it should have received in the present trouble conditions in the Middle East.

We hear over the radio today, for instance, and we read in the newspapers, that prospects for peace are looking better in the Near East; but they are looking better for one reason, namely, that Russia has come forward with a proposal. For the first time now—certainly in recent years—Russia is to be recognized as one of the great powers or forces in the Middle East. Heretofore those powers have been England, France, and the United States, primarily.

For years Russia has been trying to get into the Middle East. Of course, for many, many years Russia has been trying to reach a warm-water port. Now she has moved right in, without effort. In fact, the Middle East is virtually being given to her. I feel that that is due very largely to our not having had, many months ago, a definite, firm policy in regard to the Middle East. So we have defaulted; by our neglect we have more or less created a vacuum, when we knew that Russia would move in, as she does everywhere else, where a vacuum is created. We created a vacuum, and now Russia has a foothold in that area; in my opinion she is there to stay.

I hope the Senator from Montana will comment on that situation. In his

speech he refers to our failure to contain Russia. I do not wish to interject politics into this discussion; but I cannot help remembering that in the 1952 campaign we were severely criticized regarding the policy of containment, and our opponents said that was not sufficient, and that they were going to liberate. However, they have not liberated; they have not even contained.

We see the same sort of policy followed in Indochina. When the Geneva Conference was held, we took no part in it. In that way we were helping create a vacuum, and today the Communists have moved in. Not only are they there, but they are recognized. The northern part of Vietnam belongs to them—all as a result of the Geneva Conference.

Now what has happened in the Middle East? England has lost a great deal of her prestige and power there, as has France; and the United States simply sits back and says nothing that would give the world notice that we had a firm policy on which we would stand. In other words, we helped create the vacuum, and now Russia has moved in; and in my opinion she is there to stay. All the talk has been about arms and whether boundaries would be changed and whether the arms imbalance would be cured, and there has been talk about the arms race and about war and about similar things. But during all that time Russia was very expertly working her way in, without any trouble whatever.

Today I read in the newspapers and I hear on the radio that peace in the Middle East looks more possible because we have agreed, or it is expected we shall agree, to go along with Russia in her proposal to maintain peace in the Middle East. So, instead of our being the great peace stabilizer there, Russia is the one. She is where she has wanted to be for so long, and it did not cost her anything at all to get there.

I hope the Senator from Montana will discuss that matter, because I value very highly his extremely valuable views regarding all such matters and problems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I have to agree with him that the Soviet Union is in the Middle East, and in my opinion is in both the Middle East and in Africa to stay. I think we have overlooked the importance of the Bandung Conference of April 1955, and the fusing together of the Arab, Asian, and African nations, and the fact that since that time in the United Nations the Asian-African bloc has constantly become stronger. That is the decisive factor in some instances.

We know that since the Czech arms were sold to Egypt, there has been further Soviet and satellite penetration of Africa. Only the other day there came out a story that Russian technical assistance and Czech arms would go into the Sudan. We know that a week or so ago, Soviet Union made an offer of technical assistance to Libya, but Libya turned it down. Why? According to what I can learn from reading the newspapers, because we offered Libya \$5 million more than we already were giving her. I do not think that is the way to meet the Russian threat. I think we should spend our dollars wisely, and

should spend less dollars, not more. We should generate something in the way of ideas and understanding, and we should proceed on that basis to work with the people of other countries. In that way we should develop a policy on the basis of which we shall be accepted by other peoples—instead of making gifts for which we expect gratitude.

Mr. President, these things are facts, and we must recognize them. I say to the Senator from Alabama, that in my opinion the Soviet Union is in the Middle East and is in Africa, and is in both places to stay, and that will have to be recognized as a factor in those areas in the years to come, as well as at the present time.

Mr. President, peace in the Middle East has two facets. On the one hand, there can be no durable peace unless the tensions which threaten are relaxed and ultimately dissolved. In this connection, a stable and lasting peace will require a genuine political settlement, not merely a truce, between the Arab States and Israel. It will require the correction of ancient social and economic inequities in the Middle Eastern states. It will require the development of responsible government where presently there is little or none. It will require the determined use of modern skills and technical knowledge in an effort to turn empty deserts into fruitful, healthy lands—as Iraq, a member of the Baghdad pact, is now doing—which can sustain the millions of Middle Eastern peoples. It will require a growing unity among the states of the Middle East, a unity aimed at constructive mutual ends, rather than at political manipulation and domination.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have listened with very great interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana. He is rendering a splendid service in bringing some of the truth of this situation to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The Senator from Montana is also rendering a great service to the American people by making this information available to them.

It seems to me that the Senator from Montana has, in the last statements he has made, placed his finger on an extremely important factor in the entire situation. He has said that:

A stable and lasting peace will require a genuine political settlement, not merely a truce, between the Arab States and Israel.

I am very glad indeed that at long last the United Nations has intervened in the Middle East situation. But all of us know that the terms of reference given the United Nations are very limited, indeed. I do not believe there is a possibility that the United Nations alone will be able to secure the kind of lasting peace which I know the Senator from Montana contemplates, and which in my opinion is the only thing that will have effective value in this strife-stricken area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from New York that I agree with him that some of the duties we push on to the United Nations are really beyond its control and responsibility. I would remind the Senator from New York that the United Nations was created to come into existence and operation once peace was achieved, following the Second World War. However, during all these years there has been no peace. Consequently, we place certain responsibilities on the shoulders of the United Nations, and expect it at times to do the impossible.

I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from New York has brought out the fact that the United Nations by itself cannot do what many persons seem to expect it to do. As a matter of fact, I think that down through the years the United Nations has exceeded all expectations, in view of the difficulties under which it as an organization has had to labor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as I have said, I am very glad indeed that the United Nations has intervened. I am sure—and I am confident that the Senator from Montana will agree—that although a truce is a means of gaining time, a truce is by no means a solution of the situation. It is merely a palliative of probably short duration.

It seems to me that, Russia having stepped into the vacuum which we have created through our inaction, she will be able to block any farflung political settlement in the United Nations which, in her opinion, would weaken her position and her power of creating and fomenting trouble in this torn part of the world.

So it does not seem to me that the United Nations alone can accomplish the task that must be done. We seem to be placing all our hope in the United Nations. It does not appear to me that there is any likelihood or possibility of the United Nations bringing about a lasting peace, such as that contemplated by the Senator from Montana, and which is strongly in my mind as the only real and permanent settlement of this question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish it were possible through the United Nations.

Mr. LEHMAN. The United Nations certainly cannot cure the situation which will cause trouble so long as Russia is in the Far East, and so long as the Arab States declare their hatred against Israel and their implacable determination to wipe out the little democracy and drive its inhabitants into the sea. The many troubled relationships between the Arab States and Israel, must be solved as promptly as possible. I believe that our good offices, and the very definite and vigorous stand our country could take if it were willing to do so, represent the only hope we have for a lasting settlement and lasting peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York is correct when he states that the United Nations cannot be expected to solve the problem of peace in the Middle East. But it is doing a good job. We hope it can do better. But we should



not expect too much of the United Nations at this time.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the fact that unity is required in the states of the Middle East, a unity aimed at constructive mutual ends rather than political manipulation and domination.

These changes may seem impossible to achieve. Yet in time they must be achieved. Unless they are, there will be no peace in the Middle East except one imposed from outside the region. Mr. President, I have not pointed out anything new in citing those long-range problems of stability in the Middle East. They are well-known and they have been widely discussed. Many of our past policies have consisted of a groping for ways to assist in dealing with them.

As I have noted, however, peace in the Middle East has not 1 but 2 parts. It consists of these long-range problems, but it also has an immediate aspect. The immediate aspect is to provide a margin of time, an opportunity to deal with the long-range problems. It is precisely this margin of time, this chance, which is threatened by the present crisis between Israel and Egypt. Even if this crisis should pass, there are likely to be others, unless further steps are taken to forestall them.

In these circumstances, it seems to me that a constructive policy for the Middle East must proceed on two levels. It requires a willingness on our part to cooperate with others in dealing with the long-range problems of peace in the Middle East. It also requires us to make unmistakably clear, however, our determination to join with others in doing what may be necessary to maintain a lid on the tensions which threaten the peace of the region and the world, until they can be eased and dissolved.

If the problem of peace in the Middle East is viewed in the framework of these two principles—joint action to ease the tensions from within, and joint action to restrain them from without—then I believe we have a basis on which to maintain a constructive policy in the Middle East.

Before considering the positive aspects of such a policy, I should like to discuss certain negatives. There are elements in our present policy which have no place in a constructive policy and the sooner they are eliminated, the better the chances will be to preserve peace.

First, a constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be built on an eagerness to please everyone. That has been tried, and it has failed miserably. We have ended by pleasing no one. The way to peace in the Middle East, no less than elsewhere, is a hard one, and we shall do well to concentrate on what must be done rather than on who likes or dislikes what is done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Montana, in a characteristically delicate way, has, I think, put his finger on one of the many weaknesses in our foreign policy, namely, the desire to please everyone. Is it not true that Mr. Dulles,

on the one hand, seemed to support Portugal in its claims to the permanent possession of Goa? Then, when the opposition of India was aroused, he went to India and tried to smooth down that country.

On the one hand he gave encouragement to Pakistan, and then, to please India, made certain general statements there.

He went to Indonesia and implied help to the Indonesians in their conflicts with the Dutch over western New Guinea. Then, to placate the Dutch, he implied that he did not mean it.

In north Africa, in order to support the French, he threw cold water upon the spirit of nationalism and then implied at the same time that he was against colonialism.

In Cyprus he indicated first that we were with the Greeks, and then with the British, but he did not wish to estrange the Turks. He is for Israel, but sells arms to Saudi Arabia.

So may it not be said that in our foreign policy Mr. Dulles and the State Department have been furiously in earnest on all sides of every question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has gone into some detail in emphasizing that point. However, I think we ought to recognize that it is an impossibility to be a popular Secretary of State. We know that no Democrat could be a popular Secretary of State any more than any Republican could.

It so happens that, in the light of the times in which we live, problems are many and difficulties are great. However, I think we have gone down the middle of the road.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we gone down the middle of the road, or have we wobbled from one side to the other like a drunken sailor trying to negotiate a path in the darkness of the night?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One can go down the middle of the road and wobble from side to side at the same time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we weaved or have we not staggered and spent most of our time going sideways?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I prefer the use of the term "weave," because the word "stagger" implies something which I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not have in mind.

However, let me say that in the case of Goa, for example, it will be recalled that the Portuguese Foreign Secretary came over here at that time on an official visit. I assume that one of the things which were discussed was the renewal of the American lease in the Azores, which expires in September. It may be—and this is all assumption—that the Portuguese Foreign Minister said, "Mr. Secretary, this lease is coming up in September, covering Lagens and certain other fields in the Azores. We are very agreeable to the idea. How about saying a nice word about us in Goa?"

I think Mr. Dulles probably was in a position from which he could not extricate himself in one way or the other.

What he did, I think—and this is all assumption—was to get together with his staff, perhaps, and draft a fine document. He has a good legal mind, and he is quick with words. What he brought forth was

a document which said, in effect, that we recognize the fact that Goa has been a province of Portugal for more than 400 years. Perhaps Mr. Dulles thought that would get him out of his predicament, because he was not saying that he favored the retention of Goa by Portugal.

As soon as the news hit India, it created quite a furor which has not subsided since but has, as a matter of record, been further accentuated by the visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin.

This cause celebre is something which the Indians, who are very conscious of their newly won freedom and their aspirations, have not lost sight of since.

However, I should like again to call to the attention of the Senator that it was not many months later before the Russian team of Bulganin and Khrushchev began to do in another part of the world what Mr. Dulles had done vis-a-vis Goa. Khrushchev and Bulganin said to the Indians that Goa should belong to India. They went to Afghanistan and said that Pushtoonistan should belong to Afghanistan. Then they went back to India and said that Kashmir should belong to India, not to Pakistan. Therefore, what we have is a game going on on both sides. The only difference is that whereas we go down the middle of the road, the Russians go in either direction, depending on whatever suits them.

They are as flexible—and we hear that word a great deal today—as can be. They have no Congress to answer to, no committees to appear before, and they have no electorate to which they must report.

Therefore, we must recognize the fact that, regardless of what administration is in power the ways of a Secretary of State are extremely difficult in this day and age.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we Democrats realize that. As a matter of fact, we have observed much greater tolerance and much greater friendliness to Mr. Dulles than our Republican friends observed toward Mr. Acheson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about that. That is to the credit of the Democratic Party, because it indicates we are a party of responsible people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. I should like to say also that in my judgment Mr. Dulles would be a better Secretary of State if he did not talk quite so much, and if he did not give so many interviews. Every time he opens his mouth, he seems he put his foot into it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was interested in what the Senator said about Goa—that Goa had been settled by the Portuguese more than 400 years ago, and had been constantly occupied by Portugal since that time. I desire to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Montana that the oldest settlement in the continental United States, St. Augustine, in the State of Florida, was settled not quite 400 years ago, but we are hopeful of celebrating—that is, if the Indians have not taken us back by that time—

our 400th anniversary in 1965. I wish the Record to show that we in the State of Florida—and we hope all of the people of the United States—will continue to look forward to 1965 in the belief that the occupancy of that fine area for all this time has given us some right to stay there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Florida has just said. However, I remind the Senator that the first claim to St. Augustine, I believe, was made by Spain. I wonder what the reaction would be if Spain were to resurrect that claim of 400 years ago and try to reclaim St. Augustine as a part of its overseas empire.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not know that Spain had any overseas empire now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. She could under this assumption, reacquire the old one.

Mr. HOLLAND. If she did, I believe we would have to hold that we have rights, which may not be quite 400 years old, and that we paid Spain what we thought Florida was worth in 1821. We did not obtain our rights from Spain by conquest, but by purchase.

Therefore, I believe the argument would really have to go back to the Indians of 400 years ago. I prefer to believe that anyone who takes history seriously at all would not contend that we had not, by the development which has taken place and all the other things which have occurred since then, built good title to that very interesting and, we believe, lovable part of the earth, St. Augustine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I want to do complete justice to the Secretary of State. Let the Record show that I am certain he will not give St. Augustine back to the Indians.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Montana will yield to me, I merely wish to say that, knowing the closeness of the relations between the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the Secretary of State, I am highly relieved to have that good news. I know that we can rely upon it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have said that a constructive foreign policy cannot be built on an eagerness to please everyone, and that by doing so we usually end up by pleasing no one. I am not suggesting that our policy can or should ignore the human interest of the people of this country in the peoples of the Middle East. That factor is a part of our interest in the region and it must have a place in our policy. But it is a part, not the totality. I have enough faith in the good sense of all our citizens to believe that they will understand that concept, if it is clear that we mean to take the steps necessary to keep the peace in the Middle East.

Second, a constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained unless it is clear that this country does not intend to permit the annihilation of Israel. Conversely, it must also be clear that we shall not support Israeli expansion at the expense of the Arab States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me that if we cut away all the underbrush, the last paragraph which has been read by the distinguished Senator from Montana really is the crux of the whole situation. I wish to quote it, because it is highly important in the consideration of this very complex question. It reads as follows:

A constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained unless it is clear that this country does not intend to permit the annihilation of Israel. Conversely, it must also be clear that we shall not support Israeli expansion at the expense of the Arab States.

I wish to ask the Senator from Montana whether to his knowledge our Government—and the responsibility is that of our Government—has taken any steps whatever to give assurance that it does not intend to permit the annihilation of Israel or to support Israeli expansion at the expense of the Arab States. I know of none. I know that some very beautiful words have been uttered by our Secretary of State. However, I know of no assurance that is effective or controlling, or that has been convincing to anyone, that affirmative steps will be taken to prevent the annihilation of Israel and, conversely, the expansion of Israel at the expense of its hostile neighbors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my good friend from New York that the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 would indicate to me that there is an interest in seeing to it that preparations are not made for an aggressive attack. The only difficulty is how to define the expression "preparing to violate frontiers," and so forth.

I was assured, although not as fully as I should like to be, by the White House statement on the Middle East policy, which to me was a reiteration in great part of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, and also the reference to the use of constitutional measures in case it was necessary to engage in hostilities.

It is true that the declarations have not been strong enough, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York.

At the same time, declarations have been made, and there have been a number of meetings with congressional groups, with the idea in mind of keeping them informed, and that shows that the State Department at least is aware of the difficulties and the dangers in the powder keg atmosphere of the Middle East.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to know that our Government has kept the Committee on Foreign Relations informed. I have the greatest admiration for the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It does not seem to me, however, that any steps have been taken to correct the imbalance in military power which has taken place in the Middle East, since the agreement was reached between Soviet-controlled Czechoslovakia, and Egypt to send to the Middle East large supplies of arms. This growing imbalance has been permitted to go on, and has not

been counterbalanced in any way by our Government. In other words, our Government has sanctioned the building up of a great superiority in power which is destroying the balance of military power which had existed for many years in the Middle East. That imbalance is bound to continue to be a vital and terrifying threat to the people of Israel.

I know of no steps whatsoever that our Government has taken to remedy the imbalance in power which has already taken place or to prevent even a further increase in it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think we have faced up courageously to that question. We have approached it too indirectly. We have told the French that we have no opposition whatever; that as a matter of fact, we would approve their shipping of 12 jet planes to Israel. We have even told Canada, according to the press, that we would not be opposed to selling 30 or 40 jet planes to Israel. That, I think, is indicating an interest indirectly. That is not the proper way to do it. Either we are going to maintain the balance, or we are not; and when we approach the subject in that way, we are losing out on both sides, and not achieving anything, in the long run, so far as respect, prestige, and leadership are concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. I, of course, am not speaking from personal knowledge with regard to the shipment of arms to Israel. I am depending on reports of reputable and responsible newspapers and also on reports which have been made to me by members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

It seems to me to be a perfectly unbelievable thing that we say to our allies, whose interests should be identical with our own as ours should be identical with theirs, "Go ahead, boys. We will wink at your sending arms to the Middle East, but we are not willing to say publicly that we approve of the sending of arms."

I cannot understand how a great Nation such as ours, which has been built on high morals, which I hope will always be maintained, can take such a position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Such a roundabout policy on the basis described by the Senator from New York does this country no credit in the long run.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that so far from checking the growing power of the anti-Israel bloc, we have actually increased the power of that bloc by the sale of tanks by our Government to Saudi Arabia? However it may be explained away, the fact remains that those tanks were sold by our Government. The sale was discovered, and, because of objections of some Members of the Senate, led by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the export was temporarily suspended. But after 2 days the Department allowed them to go through. But whatever the justification, namely, that we felt we had to continue to hold the airbase in Saudi Arabia and we felt bound by previous agreements, certainly the practical effect of our own direct efforts has been to increase the military power of the Arabian bloc. Is that not correct?



Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot answer that question, but I see my friend, the Senator from Minnesota is present. He has followed that question more closely than have I. The information I have gathered from statements of the Secretary of State before the committee indicates that arms were shipped to both sides, the total being somewhere in the vicinity of \$90 million worth, of which something like \$30 million worth was shipped to Israel and the balance to Arab States.

Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not have the exact figures. From Mr. Hoover, Under Secretary of State, we have information as to the quality of arms, as well as the nature of them, such as tanks, heavy guns, light guns, and so forth. As to whether we have sold arms to Israel within the past year—

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is over a 5-year period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have sold some; I think, much more to the Arab countries than to Israel. But it is fair to say that other countries have been selling right along to both sides.

The Senator may recall in reference to the French planes which at the time the Under Secretary, Mr. Hoover, appeared—his first appearance was after the Saudi-Arabian tank matter—he indicated that there was no official decision on the part of our Government relating to the then alleged sale of the planes by the Government of France. I recall that, because I was trying to pin it down as to whether the news story was accurate, whether it was based upon rumor or upon facts, and the Under Secretary indicated that the Department did not have any information as to that. Yet, 2 days later, it was confirmed in the press.

It is that sort of thing which does not please me. I cannot help but believe that the State Department did know, through one of its consular officials or its Ambassador or through some of its diplomatic channels, that this negotiation was going on.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we did not know it we should have known it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and particularly in view of the Tripartite Agreement.

This roundabout way, as the Senator has termed it, of giving concurrence in and tacit support for the sale of arms to either the Arabian States or to Israel, on the part of our Government is at best a very faulty and, at times, could be a very dangerous policy. It does not make us any friends. It makes us look as if we were not a world leader, but a bystander. No other nation has so much at stake in the Middle East as has America. It is at the crux of the whole issue of world peace at the present time. I am really alarmed.

I have talked with some of the more responsible members of the State Department about it, and the answer I got in reference to our refusal openly to sell to Israel at their request—and the sum involved was only \$15 million—is that if we sold, then maybe the Soviet Union would sell.

What kind of nonsense is that? The Soviet Union is selling. It controls

Czechoslovakia as surely as General Motors controls Delco batteries. I think we are deluding ourselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Montana remember the aphorism of Sir Henry Wotton, who was not only a very fine English poet of the 17th century, but was also a diplomat, who defined a diplomat as "an honorable man sent abroad to lie for the good of his country"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is an old and a well-known saying. I do not know how true it is today, but I am quite certain that during the period of diplomatic history beginning with the Venetians it was a time-honored tradition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Montana feel that that definition has been completely invalidated by recent developments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Montana feel that, if not untruths, at least statements of less than the truth have been given to the American public?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not believe any deliberate untruths have been given.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois did not make such a charge.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think words have been used which have created the wrong impressions. I think wrong interpretations have been given covering certain sets of factors. But I have enough faith and confidence in the American people and in the press of the Nation to believe that the information will seep through, and that the American people perhaps know a good deal more about the actual facts of life as they exist in the world than the accounts which are issued through the various propaganda organs in Government agencies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Montana is a very optimistic man.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. So far as the field of foreign affairs is concerned, and its relation to the press, I think, by and large, the American press has done an excellent job in disseminating information from various parts of the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Montana recalls a press conference which the President held some two or three weeks ago, at which he was asked about the shipment of arms to Israel purely for its own defense. He said, No, he did not believe there would be any additional arms shipped at the present time. He did not justify that decision in any way on the ground that the arms might conceivably be a threat to Egypt or to the other Arab countries, but merely on the ground that a country as small as Israel could not absorb more arms. I wonder whether the Senator from Montana recalls that statement made by the President in a press conference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not recall that particular statement; but on the basis of all the information I have, it appears to me that Israel would have

no trouble at all, in view of all the circumstances, in absorbing that amount of arms at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to point out from my own observation or point of view that it seems to me the possibility of American open involvement in this area upon any responsibility for arms strength would be very much limited and eased if we could restore the balance of military power. The more the area gets out of balance militarily, the greater the element of danger is to the United States, first of all in terms of our own leadership in the world, or our role of responsibility; secondly, in terms of the use of American manpower, which we hope and pray will never be necessary.

I think it is fair to say that the Israeli Government has never asked for American manpower. I think that fact ought to be clearly pointed out. Certainly no Arab State has asked for American manpower.

What the Israeli Government has asked for is the weapons with which to defend themselves. I think it is very important to note that of all the countries with which we have worked in foreign policy, a great many of them have never been willing to raise their own defense forces. I shall not embarrass anyone by going down the list, but I ask Senators in their own meditations to think of all the countries in which the United States has placed military equipment, economic aid, and all other forms of assistance, only to find, time after time, that those countries have never been able or willing—I should prefer to say "able"—to train forces to defend themselves. That is perfectly true in the Asian areas and in other areas, as well.

But Israel is a country which is willing to pay for its weapons. It has 50,000 trained troops, some of the best troops in the world, and two hundred and some thousand others which they can put into uniform over night, or within 24 hours. It is a country which is willing to defend its own borders; it is willing to agree to a nonaggression pact; it is willing to accept a truce; it is willing to sit down and negotiate; it is willing, possibly, to do anything which anyone would be willing to do to bring peace to the area.

It is willing to stand its own ground without asking for one American soldier, or even one American military training mission.

It seems somewhat foolhardy to deny to a country like that the tools with which to maintain the balance of power, provided firm commitments of nonaggression are obtained.

I think our Government's obligation, under the Tripartite Agreement, as Winston Churchill said 2 days ago, is a matter of honor. In the Tripartite Agreement of 1950, we pledged ourselves to make certain that those borders remained inviolate until such time as there could be a settlement of any boundary disputes. The United States, Great Britain, and France agreed that those

borders should remain inviolate until a peaceful settlement was made.

Until that matter can be settled peacefully, the least that ought to be done, it seems to me, is to sell to a willing, democratic nation, a free nation, a nation of freedom-loving people, the tools with which to take care of themselves. I think that is the objective of our foreign policy.

I submit that if that shall not be done, and Israel should be overrun, then, because of the indirect political commitments of this country, the United States will be directly involved. I hope and pray that that will not happen.

I want the American people to know that one of the best ways of preventing the United States from becoming involved in hostilities is to let other countries have the means with which to defend themselves. We will then be in the position of saying there shall be no aggression; that there will be peaceful settlement, economic growth and political stability, rather than hostilities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is not that what the Soviet Union does with its satellites and other countries in which it is interested? The Soviet looks out for itself, while letting the other countries carry out what is, in effect, Russian policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Montana upon his able speech. I am coming to him, really, for help. As the Senator may know, in times past I have supported proposals for foreign military and economic aid, because I have believed they were both a part of the defense of the United States. I did so under a Democratic administration, and I have done so under a Republican administration.

Incidentally, every time I supported foreign aid, as requested by the Republican administration, when I have gone back to my own State of Illinois, I have found myself publicly and bitterly attacked by the Illinois Republicans. So I have taken such action to support the administration at considerable risk to myself. There is a certain irony in the matter; namely, that when one supports the Republican administration, then all the smudge-pots of the Republican Party are turned loose upon him. The Republican administration does not thank him; on the contrary, they try to defeat him and join in the assault.

I have, however, been trying to make up my mind about what I shall do this year. I have been studying the testimony given by Secretary Dulles before the Committee on Foreign Relations on February 24 of this year. I hold a copy of those hearings in my hand. I find that the Senator from Montana was present at that meeting, as he generally is at such meetings. I should like to ask him if the impression which he received from the testimony is the same as the impression which I have gained from a reading of the transcript of the testimony.

Secretary Dulles implied that Russia was weak internally in certain vital respects—agriculturally, in the field of consumers' goods, and so on. The implication which I drew was that Russia

was diminishing in strength. Is the Senator from Illinois correct in that assumption?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Secretary Dulles, stated, at page 22 of the hearings, that he had confidence that the policies espoused by Chancellor Adenauer would continue to prevail in Germany.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the Secretary said that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Secretary implied that we need not worry about the French situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I believe he said that. He mentioned something about the permanent French civil service, as I recall his testimony.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He implied that we need not be worried about the conditions in Jordan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assume that is so; I do not recall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, almost immediately afterward, Colonel Glubb was ousted from Jordan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; within a month or so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Secretary Dulles implied, in response to a question asked by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that the fears of the Israeli that they might be exterminated were unfounded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; that is correct. In general, the Secretary said things were not too bad; they could be worse.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, at page 59 of the hearings, the Secretary implied that the forces of liberalization were setting in within the Soviet Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I observe, by reading the Record, that that statement is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not the general impression given by him was that the strength of the United States and the free world had increased during the past year, and that the strength of the Soviet Union had diminished, and that there was not much to worry about?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I gathered from the newspapers, and it is what I gather from studying in detail a transcript of the testimony.

Is it not also true that at just about the same time Secretary Dulles was testifying everything was going well, he also proposed a bill asking for \$4,900,000,000 for foreign aid, or about twice the amount asked in previous years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. That is a little different. The figure is correct, but I think at a meeting of the leaders on December 13, Mr. Dulles did tell the leaders he was going to ask for about \$100 million more this year; but Secretary of Defense Wilson did not tell the leaders the Defense Department was going to ask for \$2 billion more for defense assistance. That is where the figure of \$2 billion comes from. The total is \$4.9 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which is almost twice the amount requested last year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And it does not fit in with the rosy picture painted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Whom is the Senator from Illinois to believe? If he believes

the Secretary of State in his testimony, he will have to vote against foreign aid, because, quite obviously, if things are improving, we do not need twice as much money.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would suggest that the Senator from Illinois do his best to fuse contrasting and contradictory testimony and then do what he believes in.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And what is that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That the Senator make up his own mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must judge by the testimony of persons who are supposed to know. I had always thought the Secretary of State was the official spokesman for this Government on foreign affairs. On the one hand, he says things are improving. On the other hand, he asks us to vote almost twice as much money as we voted last year. Am I to believe Secretary Dulles on the 24th of February, and vote for a big cut in foreign aid, or am I to believe him on some other day, when he comes up to Congress and asks for a doubling of foreign aid? Which statement am I to believe, or whom am I to believe, or is Secretary Dulles not one, but many persons?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois really has hold of a complex problem, but I am quite certain the Senator from Illinois will, as he does in all matters, come to the right conclusion, and vote accordingly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Secretary of State and the administration have those of us on the Democratic side who want to help them over a barrel. On the one hand, if we do not vote for \$4.9 billion, they will say we are not cooperating with them. On the other hand, if we vote for \$4.9 billion, we know we are going to be attacked by the Republican Party for wasting money in efforts which are not needed, in view of the world situation. Secretary Dulles' testimony of February 24 will then be thrown back at us. I suggest that if our Republican friends want cooperation from those of us on this side of the aisle, they should tell us what the actual facts are. While I have been very sympathetic to foreign aid in the past, I shall want to know the truth before I shall vote for the \$4.9 billion. If there are any members of the State Department in the gallery, as I assume there are, let them carry that message back. Some of us are being "fed up" with being used as pawns in this matter, and having our good faith and desire to cooperate abused. We do not relish being treated as simpletons and being alternately gulled and reviled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to say the Senator from Illinois has expressed the sentiments which I have heard expressed in the cloakroom and elsewhere. I see heads being nodded in assent. I am sure the Senator particularly well recalls the difficulty we had last year, with respect to the foreign-aid bill, in getting accurate information with respect to so-called unobligated funds. In fact, the Senator may recall that on



the very day we were voting on the foreign-aid bill, the amount of the funds which were still unexpended were changing by the hour. I recall the Senator received cabled information from one of our commanders overseas—I believe it was General Gruenther—as to funds which were still unobligated or unexpended, which had not been reported to us by the State Department or Defense Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall that very well. One billion two hundred million dollars was not reported, because, as I remember, the Defense Department officials told us they would have a carry-over of only \$100 million. When we got through, it turned out to be \$1,300,000,000. And in the last 5 hours of the last day of the last fiscal year, the Defense Establishment reserved \$614 million, which could just as easily be unreserved the next day, the first day of the new fiscal year.

Oh, yes, this aid program can stand a lot of probing, and I am delighted that the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has seen fit to bring before us, during the last several weeks, a proposal to carry on a thorough investigation of the entire foreign-aid program, so we shall know where we are going, what our objectives are, and just how useful this kind of program really is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not fair to suggest that one of the aspects of the foreign-aid program which needs to be laid bare to the Senate is the budgeting, the accounting, the disbursing, and the expenditures, because it is in that field that we have always received so little information and so much inaccurate information—the amount of carry-over, unexpended balances, and what is in the so-called pipeline of movement of supplies and equipment from the previous year's appropriation?

I do not think Congress can be expected to legislate on such matters unless all the necessary information is in its possession. I think one other point which the Senator from Illinois may have raised, and which I did not immediately detect, is the fact that last year and the year before we were told the foreign aid bill would be reduced, and that next year it would be reduced further, that the next year it would go down some more, and it was hoped that we would get out of this business. In fact, that was said last year. What happened this year was that the unexpended balances which had been carried over from previous years and the previous administration had been sorely depleted. It is like the fellow who inherited some money. He finally got around to spending his inheritance. One day he had to go to work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean the administration is now working on the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration is asking for money—not to give more foreign aid. We are not going to give more foreign aid; we are only going to keep up what we are now doing. But the administration has to ask for more money because it spent that which was

in the cash register, and which the administration inherited. Sooner or later we will have to take stock. If we have not been misled, we also have not been properly informed.

Also, with respect to the so-called long-term aid program which has been publicized so much, I call attention to the fact that there is provided only \$100 million in the whole bill. When one reads of the President's proposal, he would think the President had a great, new, imaginative program, of worldwide impact and effect. There is provided in the foreign aid bill a total of only \$100 million of long-term economic aid, unless I am sorely misinformed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is groping for the truth, and he finds himself greatly mystified by the conflicting policies of this administration. The Senator from Illinois is going to put the welfare of the country first, but he is quite certain, whatever he does, the Republican Party will choose some phase of the testimony with which to defeat and revile any Democrat who takes any stand on any issue. If we believe the Secretary of State, then we shall be accused of not cooperating with the President. If we believe the President, we shall be accused of ignoring the advice of the Secretary of State. So they have us coming and going. I only hope the American people realize the kind of shell game that is being played.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope we can help them realize it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps what we Democrats should do is to refuse to vote and let the administration see if they can carry their measures with only Republican votes. In self-respect that is perhaps what we should do.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to say that I think the Senator from Illinois has given a very fair, clear, and persuasive analysis of this situation and of what the Republican Party will seek to do.

However, I am not very much in doubt personally about my position in this matter. I think I know what I shall do, and I have no hesitation in stating it now. I do not believe for a moment in the optimistic and rosy reports, which have come to us from the State Department, in regard to the world situation. I think the situation, instead of improving has deteriorated. I believe that today we are in as great danger as we have ever been in since the end of the Second World War.

Mr. President, because I do not believe those optimistic and rosy reports, I shall vote for a larger appropriation this year, compared to the appropriations in recent years, because I think an increased appropriation is absolutely necessary.

However, I wish to know more regarding the division that will be made of the funds. I want authoritative information. I am not by any means certain that most of the increase in the appropriation should be made available for military aid. Instead, it seems to me that increased amounts should be made available for economic, technical, and social aid, so as to improve living conditions in the countries we seek to help, and thus keep them from coming under the influence of the Soviet Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that the analysis made by the Senator from New York is an appropriate one, and represents good, sound judgment.

I desire to emphasize that the open military budget, this year, of the Soviets—their military budget available to all the world to see, and not including any hidden figures—indicates that for this year the military expenditures by the Soviet Union will be increased 12 percent. Therefore, I believe it incumbent upon us to weigh that fact at all times as we consider our defenses and our foreign-aid program.

The smiles of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev are backed up by cold steel; and the little black suitcase they carry does not have campaign contributions in it. Instead, that little suitcase is but a reminder of the military strength of the Soviet Union—which makes their smile all the more threatening and diabolical.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to continue with my remarks. I come to my third point, as follows:

Third. A constructive policy in the Middle East cannot be maintained if it is concentrated on the protection of our economic interests in the Middle East to the virtual exclusion of all others. Earlier in my remarks, I addressed myself to the importance of these interests. They are of the greatest importance, and I believe we should make every reasonable effort to retain and even enlarge them. We are not likely to be successful in this effort, however, if their retention becomes a be-all and an end-all. If our foreign policy speaks with the full voice of the people of the United States, that will not be the case. It will be clear to any who may have thought otherwise, that whatever the importance of these American economic interests, it is not such that we will make a craven sacrifice of other peoples' interests, of our own total interests, and of world peace.

Fourth. A constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained by seeking to buy peace or good will in that region. As I have already noted, economic development is a key factor in developing conditions of stability. We have assisted in this process in the middle eastern states in the past, and we should continue willingly to assist.

There can be no economic development, however, if violence stalks the region. Economic development cannot take place unless there exists on the part of the people directly involved a desire to

turn from destructive to constructive objectives. We cannot instill that desire. If it is there, we can help; and we should help if help is sought. But there can be no bargaining, no bribery, no trading of a TVA Jordan River development or an Aswan Dam in Egypt, for example, in the expectation that in this fashion we shall please possible aggressors. A policy based on an appeasement of that kind is more likely to feed the flames of destructive ambition, rather than to quell them.

Fifth. A constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained without a clearer evaluation on the part of the executive branch than so far evident, of the changed tactics of the Soviet Union and the implications of the changes for ourselves and other free nations. In the Middle East, as elsewhere, our policies have been built largely on a base of the military containment of possible military aggression by the Soviet Union. The Baghdad Pact, which links the United Kingdom, Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq, and Iran, is part of the defensive pattern which evolved from these policies. So, too, is the Balkan Pact of Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. We have supported both of these pacts. We have aided the members individually to build both their economic and their defensive strength.

The policy of emphasis on military containment was correct, in my opinion, 8 years ago, 5 years ago, 3 years ago. Military containment is still essential today; but the question we must answer with logic, rather than with slogans, is whether the emphasis on military factors in total policy for the Middle East should be the same today as it was 3, 5, or 8 years ago. Frankly, I do not know. I wonder whether the executive branch knows.

Certainly, it is idle to ignore the fact that the Communists have jumped the wall of containment in the Middle East, not with military power, but with a powerful diplomatic, economic, and cultural offensive which has driven all the way from Syria to the Sudan. It is just as idle to suggest that the sole answer to these new tactics is necessarily a response in kind on our part. From the point of view of constructive policy we need first to have a perceptive understanding and evaluation of these new Soviet policies; and if adjustments in our present approach are indicated, the executive branch should make that clear to the American people.

Sixth. A constructive policy, Mr. President, cannot be built on an absolute reliance on the United Nations to maintain peace in the Middle East. The United Nations has already made a major contribution. Even now, the Secretary-General of the organization is in the Middle East attempting to conciliate the contending forces. His mission has the endorsement of the great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States included.

It may well be that if the great powers continue to agree, all that needs to be done can be done through the United Nations. We ought not to place impos-

sible burdens on that organization, however, and then be dismayed when it cannot carry them. We ought not to forget that the United Nations is powerless, except as a voice of world opinion, in the event there is disagreement among the great powers.

It seems to me a matter of elementary prudence that while we hope for the agreement and cooperation of the Soviet Union and others in keeping the peace of the Middle East through the United Nations, we prepare ourselves for disagreement and noncooperation. We may well face a situation which will require action in accord with the charter of the United Nations, to be sure, but outside the United Nations.

I should like to turn now from the negative to the positive aspects of a constructive policy in the Middle East. It seems to me that if we are to have such a policy it must be built around these elements.

First. We should have a clear pledge by the President of the United States that this Nation shall join with all others willing to cooperate in preventing any changes by force in the present boundary demarcations between Israel and the surrounding Arab States. This pledge should not prejudice a final settlement of this question.

Second. We should begin now, in cooperation with others, to plan the measures which may be necessary to prevent a major outbreak of violence in the Middle East or to stop one if it should occur. The Tripartite Declaration of 1950, in my opinion, is inadequate to meet the needs of the present situation. Dangerous and difficult measures may be required to keep the peace and the sacrifices entailed should be shared on the widest possible scale.

Until evidence of unwillingness to accept the responsibilities for maintaining peace in the Middle Eastern situation is unmistakably clear, no nation should be excluded from participating in carrying out those responsibilities. The logical site for considering this question is in the United Nations. If necessary, however, the President should be prepared to meet in a Big 4 Conference with the Soviet Union, France, and the United Kingdom, or in a Seven-Nation Conference which would also include India, Turkey, and Pakistan, to consider measures necessary to prevent an outbreak of war in the Middle East.

Third. We should call at once a conference of the Western European nations which depend on middle-eastern petroleum, and the oil-producing nations of this hemisphere. If the peace is to be kept in that area, measures may have to be taken which will shut off, at least temporarily, Western Europe's major source of petroleum. The immediate problem is to find alternatives not only to the oil but to the income which the production and processing of oil represents to certain Western European countries.

In a similar vein, the American people need to have a clearer understanding of

the part which American oil production in the Middle East has played in the situation there. The press is full of reports as to how royalties paid in advance have been used in political manipulations to finance preparations for war, and in other dubious ways. We need the facts in this situation, and Congress has the power to get them if necessary.

We also have an obligation to the investors in those American enterprises in the Middle East. Measures of policy which may have to be taken could entail heavy sacrifices on their part, and the United States Government should be prepared to ease these sacrifices.

Fourth. We should reexamine now our need for bases and alignments in the Middle East, in the light of shifting Soviet tactics and the progress in weapons development. We should consider abandoning those which may no longer be essential or which can be retained only on dishonorable terms.

Fifth. We should develop a new concept of aid programs in the Middle East. It should be aid after, not before, it is clear that any given nation means to turn from the path of war to the path of peace, and we ought not hesitate to shut off aid entirely if it is evident that war is the objective of any state in that region. Nor should fear of what the Soviets may do or not do in this matter cause us to swerve from a determination to supply aid in this pattern. Least of all can we have aid policies based on a craven submission to blackmail in the mistaken belief that it will buy peace.

Sixth. We should recognize, in the Cyprus situation, that the present crisis in the Middle East requires the presence of British military power on the island. We can do so without prejudicing the claims—and the rights—of the Cypriotes to self-determination.

I believe this country's friendship and behavior over the past decade toward Greece, Turkey, and Britain gives us the right to enjoin restraint on them in the Cyprus question. Even more, our common dedication to NATO requires that we do so.

The positive measures which I have been discussing, Mr. President, contain only the outlines and suggestions of a constructive policy. They concern largely the pressure from without which is necessary to hold in check the tensions in the Middle East. There is still the whole range of questions which must be dealt with to ease the tensions from within. I believe, however, that whatever influence this country can exert on those long-range problems will be more usefully and effectively felt once our own position is made clear.

Mr. President, let me say in closing that I do not underestimate the fearful responsibilities which fall to the President in the Middle Eastern crisis. Under our system of Government, they can fall nowhere else, not even in the National Security Council, not in the Senate, and not in the Congress. The President can come to the legislative branch for reassurance, if he feels that he requires it, as he did in the case of Formosa.



In the end, however, the responsibility for the execution of our foreign policy is his. He cannot share that responsibility of his office without doing violence to the Constitution, and without jeopardizing the safety of the Nation. The Senate can advise—and ultimately its consent is essential—but it is for the President to act. If he acts with clarity, with firmness, within the framework of total interests of the United States, we shall have a constructive policy for peace in the Middle East. It will be a policy that shall not lack for support from the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### THE CITATION OF WENDELL H. FURRY FOR CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

During the delivery of Mr. MANSFIELD's speech,

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me so that I may make an unusual request? I have just left a hearing of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and the chairman has asked me to return immediately so that a quorum may be maintained.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. The chairman of the subcommittee has asked me to return immediately so that a quorum may be maintained. I have a three-page explanation to make with regard to my refusal to testify in a contempt case. I very much dislike to make this request of the Senator from Montana, but I would very much appreciate the Senator's yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been giving up my time all afternoon. Therefore I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin to make his remarks, provided I do not lose the floor and that the interruption appear in the *Record* at the conclusion of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we are again confronted with a situation where an irresponsible judge is obstructing efforts by the Senate to investigate and expose Communists. On August 11, 1954, the Senate unanimously cited Mr. Wendell H. Furry for contempt of Congress for his refusal to testify before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concerning his former Communist associates. Yet it will be impossible to get a conviction because the case is to be heard by Judge Bailey Aldrich, a demonstrably incompetent and irresponsible judge, whose past conduct proves that he will not rule fairly and objectively in a Communist case.

I say to my friend, the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who has been kind enough to yield to me so that I may make this statement, that I rise to explain why I will refuse to testify in this case. It is something that I must explain to the Senate. I will refuse to testify unless the Senate asks me to do so.

As the chairman of the subcommittee before which Furry committed contempt of Congress, I have been requested by the Justice Department to testify in the Furry case. While I would be very glad to testify if the case were going to be heard by an unbiased judge, I am advising the Justice Department that I will not testify unless Judge Aldrich withdraws from the case. I will not, if I can help it, be a party to the miscarriage of justice that is bound to occur in Judge Aldrich's court in any case involving communism.

Let me be very clear, Mr. President, as to reasons why Judge Aldrich is unqualified to hear this case. Last fall, an almost identical case was heard before Judge Aldrich's court, the case of U. S. against Leon J. Kamin. Kamin, like Furry, had been unanimously cited by the Senate for contempt of Congress for refusing to divulge the names of his former Communist associates. But thanks to Judge Aldrich's completely irresponsible conduct, and his almost incredible rulings, Kamin was acquitted.

To begin with, Judge Aldrich refused to let a jury hear the case. A jury had been impaneled, but Aldrich used as an excuse for discharging the jury the fact that I had been applauded in the corridors of the courthouse as I was coming to testify. Then, after he had arbitrarily given himself complete control of the case, Aldrich made a number of ridiculous rulings that assured Kamin's acquittal. His decisive and most absurd ruling was that a subcommittee which had been authorized to investigate "the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency" had exceeded its jurisdiction when it investigated communism in defense plants that were supplied with Government funds and which were under the security supervision of Government security officers.

I thought at the time that these extraordinary rulings could be explained only by the fact that Judge Aldrich was prejudiced. Several months later these suspicions were confirmed when I learned that Judge Aldrich had refused to sign a non-Communist oath several weeks before the Kamin trial. He refused to sign an affidavit saying, No. 1, "I am not a member of the Communist Party," and No. 2, "I am not now, nor have I ever been, nor shall I ever knowingly become a member of any organization that believes in, or advocates, the overthrow by force of our American form of government." Judge Aldrich finally signed this affidavit only after heavy pressure had been exerted on him by Massachusetts government officials.

Clearly this rebellious attitude against signing a non-Communist oath indicated prejudice on Judge Aldrich's part in cases involving Communists. Yet he failed to disqualify himself on grounds of bias, as any responsible judge would have done in a Communist case.

Mr. President, in the Furry matter we have an almost identical case. It is therefore a foregone conclusion that

Judge Aldrich will acquit Furry just as he acquitted Kamin. Under the circumstances, it would be an utter waste of time for me or any other Senator to testify. If there were any chance of getting a fair hearing of the case, it would be a different matter. But in Judge Aldrich's kangaroo court, the Government has not the slightest hope of obtaining a conviction. Not only that: Judge Aldrich, in the Kamin case, insulted the Senate by refusing to uphold its contempt citation; we should not give Aldrich the opportunity to insult the Senate again. We should not invite a repetition of that shameful spectacle.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the United States attorney in Boston, Mr. Anthony Julian, and his assistant, Mr. John M. Harrington, Jr., have done a splendid job in preparing the Kamin and Furry cases. It would be unfortunate if their hard work should come to naught because of the willful irresponsibility of Judge Aldrich.

The correct thing for Judge Aldrich to do is withdraw from this case and permit it to be heard by another judge. I hope he does so. I hope that Judge Aldrich realizes that his conduct in the Kamin case was a disgrace to the whole Federal judiciary, and that the public's confidence in the judiciary will be further shaken if he fails to withdraw from the Furry case.

Mr. President, let me make it very clear to the Senate that while I think it would be a grave mistake for me to appear in Judge Aldrich's court to testify, when we know that there cannot be a conviction in a Communist case, if the Senate feels that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, and after it has voted contempt in the case, should go to the court and make this useless gesture, I shall accede to the Senate's request.

May I say to the able Senator from Montana that I greatly appreciate his yielding time for me to make these comments so that I can return to the investigating subcommittee. I hope I can return the favor at some time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator may have that opportunity.

#### PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a proposed unanimous consent agreement, which is submitted on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I ask that the proposed agreement be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That effective on Thursday, April 19, 1956, after the conclusion of routine morning business, the call of the legislative calendar, and the treaties on the Executive Calendar, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution, debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RELIEF FROM FLOOD DISASTERS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in the Senate for their action today in unanimously approving four of my bills arising from the flood disasters which afflicted my own State of Connecticut and other States in the Northeast during 1955.

Three of the bills should help speed the task of relief and rehabilitation should we have the misfortune to suffer a repetition of disaster. These bills would: First, authorize an increase in FHA mortgage insurance for 100 per-

cent guaranteed disaster loans for repair or replacement of homes from \$7,000 to \$12,000; second, provide for rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy disaster victims; and, third, permit stockpiling of temporary housing for disaster relief.

The fourth, most important of all, is S. 3272, to expedite the construction of small flood-control works for the protection of our communities. This bill, when finally enacted, will enable the Army engineers to break through the bottleneck of time which has been the most serious obstruction to speedy action for permanent flood protection.

It is my hope that the House of Representatives will act promptly on all of these measures. Together with bills previously approved by the Senate, they are an important part of our over-all program to provide the people the protection against the ravages of floods for which the need was so tragically demonstrated in 1955.

#### THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have read with great alarm President Eisenhower's farm bill veto message. With equal alarm and bitter disappointment, that I am sure is shared by the farmers of America, I listened to his nationwide broadcast on this matter.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee that held extensive hearings with farmers on farm problems all over America last year, as one who helped draft the Senate Agriculture Committee's version of a farm bill, as a member of the conference committee that drafted the final measure agreed upon by both Houses of Congress which President Eisenhower vetoed, and as the senior Senator from a State that is chiefly agricultural and whose agrarian population is principally made up of small farmers, depending greatly upon the agricultural policy of government, I feel dutybound to take the President of the United States to task for his veto, his reasoning behind his veto, his report to the people on his action, and his request for soil-bank legislation.

President Eisenhower said in his television message to the people that he was not a politician and that his veto was based upon what is best for the farmers and what is best for the entire Nation.

His implication was that we in Congress played politics in writing the farm bill. That is political slander. I am afraid Mr. Eisenhower is too much of a general to understand that we in Congress represent and work for the interests of a diversity of people from various sections of the Nation that grow a vast variety of agricultural commodities. Certainly there were many amendments offered by many Senators to the farm bill. Many were adopted and many were voted down. In committee we gave and took legislation, always in the best possible interest of the people of this Nation as a whole.

If any Senator or Representative wanted to play politics with farm legislation he would certainly choose an easier way to do it than to spend months in the field listening to the problems of the farmers from the farmers, and then more months attempting to forge out a bill reflecting the needs of the farmers, as we in the Congress did.

On the contrary, in speaking of politics and farmers, I am wondering if Mr. Eisenhower has ever listened to farmers and if he has once looked into the farm bill he vetoed and figured out what he has deprived the farmers of in dollars and cents by his action.

The fact is that by vetoing the farm bill, President Eisenhower has literally taken \$2,334,000,000 out of the farmers' pockets. His veto will cost farmers \$2,334,000,000 in reduced income. He did not tell the people this the other night. No. He did not tell the people that by vetoing 90 percent of parity he had reduced farmers' cash income by \$490 million on basic commodities alone, and \$144 million in grain feeds, and \$1,700,000,000 in conservation and soil bank payments that would have functioned with rigid controls and 90 percent of parity backing up the farmer in his participation of that program.

President Eisenhower did not tell the people that cotton under the 90 percent of parity bill passed by Congress would bring the farmers \$1,717,000,000, but that under the program President Eisenhower will manage, the farmer will only net \$1,558,000,000, realizing a loss of \$159 million. Broken down simply, it means that the President's principle of less income for the farmer is best for the farmers and that neither the farmers nor Congress know anything about agricultural problems. This veto of Mr. Eisenhower's is costing farmers a loss of approximately \$9 per acre of cotton they grow; \$10 per acre of rice; \$9 per acre of peanuts; \$4 per acre of wheat; and \$2 per acre of commercial corn.

Under the bill passed by Congress, corn farmers would have received \$957 million. But because of the President's veto, they will receive 84 percent of parity, or \$870 million, realizing a loss of \$87 million. Wheat, under the congressional 90 percent of parity, would bring \$1,768,000,000, but, as a result of President Eisenhower's veto, will bring the farmers only \$1,558,000,000, realizing a loss of \$210 million. On peanuts, the farmers would have received \$162 million, but because of the President's veto they will get only \$144 million, realizing a loss of \$18 million. As for rice, the story is the same. Under the bill passed by Congress farmers would have received \$200 million, but because of President Eisenhower they will get only \$184 million, realizing a loss of \$16 million. These figures can be verified by the Legislative Research and Reference Division of the Library of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by the Legislative Research and Reference Division of the Library of Congress.



There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Support prices and indicated value of marketings for 1956*

(Based upon average yield from acreage allotments (cotton) and intentions to plant (parity as of Mar. 15, 1956))  
(Millions of dollars)

Commodity	Indicated marketings		90 percent of the higher parity provided by Congress	Value to farmer	President proposes resulting from veto	Value to farmer	Total loss in basic commodity income to farmers resulting from veto
	Unit	Quantity					
Cotton	Million bales	10.8	0.3180	1,717	(0.2885)	1,558	159
Wheat	Million bushels	779	2.27	1,768	2.60	1,558	210
Corn	do.	580	1.65	957	1.50	870	87
Rice	Thousand hundredweight	40,876	4.90	200	4.50	184	16
Peanuts	Million pounds	1,350	.12	162	.107	144	18
Total				4,804		4,314	490
Feed grain losses resulting from veto							144
Total loss in grains and basic commodities resulting from veto							634
Loss in soil bank and conservation payments resulting from veto							1,700
Grand total veto loss to farmers							2,334

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on and on the difference goes and up and up mounts the loss in income to farmers. Surely the President does not think the farmers of America will swallow his story claiming that he has done what is best for the farmers. He said 90 percent of parity was best for the farmers in 1952. He should have traveled with the Senate Agriculture Committee last fall if he wanted to know something about farm problems. He speaks of grass-roots movements in his veto message. He is probably an authority on grass roots; but I am inclined to believe that the only grass roots on which he is an authority are on the golf greens. What he should know is something about the farmers' cost of living versus the farmers' shrinking income. If he had wanted really to help the farmers he would have approved the bill, which would have given the farmers more than \$2½ billion.

He has completely broken his word and faith with the farmers of the Nation. I am not calling him a political liar. If he were not the President of the United States, I do not know how far I would go. In Columbia, S. C., in his campaign speech, he promised the people he would back 90 percent of parity without any "ifs, ands, or buts." Since then he said he meant 90 percent of parity in the marketplace. This is not what he promised, and to keep the record straight I will quote now exactly what he said in Columbia, S. C., on October 1, 1952, when he was seeking the farmers' vote:

For example, I believe wholeheartedly and without any "ifs" or "buts" in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

Candidate Eisenhower did not say he favored a program. He did not say he favored 90 percent of parity in the marketplace. He did not say he favored some sort of a program, and certainly he made no mention of sliding parity. He specifically said he favored the "present program" of 90-percent price supports, and the "present program" at that time was the same 90-percent support program Congress passed last week, and which President Eisenhower said was a major cause of his veto. He talks of principles and people. What kind of principle is it that makes a man say he is for the farmers, promise them con-

tinuation of a program, and then after election kills the bill that would do what he had promised, and reduces the farmers' income by more than \$2 billion? He has confused principles with military tactics, for certainly no man would do such a thing except for expediency to win a point or to win a battle. And in this case the point is covering up his own failures with confusion.

This does not sound like the same man that vetoed the 90 percent of parity farm bill in the White House does it? Well, it's the very same Ike who promised a lot of other things. I must say, either the man in the White House has purposely for political reasons misguided the people or he does not even know what he reads that others write for him.

Robert Montgomery is a good movie actor, but is a very poor adviser on farm problems.

The President wants the soil-bank program, but he does not want 90 percent of parity. Well, he might as well know now that one will not work without the other. The farmer has got to have protection in the form of income for what he does grow before he can ever justify retiring his acreage out of production. It stands to reason that the less a man makes per acre of soil the more he will be inclined to plant, and the less he will retire into the soil bank.

To understand this problem, let us look at what happened with sliding parity prices and acreages. Mr. Eisenhower claims, as one of his reasons for the veto, that 90 percent of parity induces production and mounts surpluses. He does not know what he is talking about.

On every hand where sliding parity supports were applied to commodities—and the parity dropped as it always does in sliding programs—production skyrocketed. Proof of this is shown in the following figures regarding 10 commodities from 1952 to 1955:

Crop	Support level, percent down	Production, percent up
Oats	22	30
Sorghum grain	24	173
Soybeans	20	30
Milk	17	9
Barley	23	71
Flaxseed	23	42
Rye	17	75
Rice	8	2
Corn	1	6

Again, all we have to do is look at the 1954-55 figures on some of these same commodities to see that President Eisenhower does not know what he is talking about when he says by replacing 90 percent of parity with sliding low parity that production will be cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which I have before me may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Crop	Support level, percent down	Production, percent up
Corn	3	7
Oats	5	9
Sorghum grain	15	11
Soybeans	10	13
Milk	15	3
Barley	15	4
Flaxseed	5	4
Rye	15	21

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to the contrary, the production records under 90 percent of parity, when it was in operation, show a distinct stability in production.

One point I would like to make here in particular is the moral obligation the Congress and anyone who is President owes to the farmers.

At the outset of World War II, we were faced with the need for tremendous expansion on all fronts, including trained manpower, more industry output, and more food than ever before in our history.

All sorts of programs were instituted by the Government to train people for defense jobs and inducements were handed out to get manpower to shift around the country as the need arose. Necessary gigantic expansion of industry was induced by governmental offers of Government-financed factories, tax concessions, conversion payments, cost-plus contracts, all effectively guaranteeing profits and eliminating risks. After the war, the Government gave industry reconversion subsidies and sold whole factories for a few cents on the dollar value. In short, industries' so-called wartime surplus capacity was practically a cost-free net gain on many fronts financed by the taxpayers.

All together, aside from hidden dollars not accounted for, the Government gave outright to industry for its reconversion between 40 and 50 billion dollars, but not so with the farmers.

On the other hand, farmers, who had expanded their output to meet wartime requirements, had been induced solely by appeals to their patriotism and the possibilities of improved income. No financing and subsidies were offered to farmers. Agriculture output rose 32 percent per man over 1935-39 levels. Farmers of our Nation produced more food than ever before in our history.

The only thing the farmer received was a promise to provide 90 percent price supports to aid him in adjusting back to normal times.

As to a great many of these commodities, the Government made money. On cotton, for instance, the Government, up to the first of this year, made a net profit of \$258 million.

But we have never really returned to normal times, and will not for years to come. Now, the President has broken his word—that is a nice way of saying it—his promise, and his faith with the farmers. He has forgotten people and principles. He is totally infected with the disease of the Republican Party that has plagued the little people of this country since the first Republican drew breath.

Another thing is the ridiculous proposal of the President to get Congress to pass a soil-bank program by itself with no high supports to protect the farmers' income while they are retiring some of their soil into the soil-bank or conservation program.

Take cotton, for instance. The national average acre of cotton brings the farmer around \$110 under the 90 percent of parity bill we passed in Congress.

Under the program by the President, this same acre of cotton with 82½ percent of parity will bring the farmer only \$101.75. The President, under his plan, wants the farmers to place some of their cotton acreage under the soil-bank program. For this, President Eisenhower will pay him a certain percentage of the existing parity value of the cotton. Estimates from the Department of Agriculture indicate that Mr. Benson will pay the farmers 50 percent of the parity value of each acre of cotton placed into the soil-bank program. This would mean a farmer would be entitled to get about \$50.87 per acre of cotton, placed into the soil bank.

But, as the President announced, he will only give the farmer one-half of this amount in 1956 and the other half in 1957. This means that for each acre of cotton put out of commission into the soil bank that President Eisenhower will give the participating farmer about \$25.44.

In effect, what the President is saying is this: Ninety percent of parity which would bring the farmers \$110 per acre of cotton in 1956 is bad for the farmers and their sagging economy. Let me help you out. You put that \$110 crop into my bank and I will give you \$25.44 and you will not have to even work for it.

There are many small farmers in my State who plant less than 4 acres of cotton.

I have just ascertained by telephone that there are in South Carolina approximately 18,630 farmers who have under 4 acres of cotton planted.

What President Eisenhower is asking them to do is to exchange a 4-acre cotton crop—under 90 percent of parity worth \$440—for 4 acres of nothing worth \$91.76. This sounds like some kind of Russian agricultural roulette game which will result in sure-fire suicide for our small farmers. To me or to anyone else who understands the farmers and their needs, it certainly does not sound like a bank, free enterprise, good government, or good business.

The farmers' income a few years ago was \$17,200,000,000. Now it is less than \$10 billion this means he has lost over \$7 billion in income.

Every year income has been reduced approximately 38 percent. During the same time, I find that the things which the farmer has had to buy have skyrocketed in price; they have gone up approximately 60 percent.

This points out the ridiculous nature of the President's proposals for a soil bank without 90 percent of parity to back it up. In effect, he is saying "I know you need help, so, to replace your lost \$7 billion, I offer you a \$500 million soil-bank program. But before you can get this," he tells the farmer, "you must cut your income further by reducing the crops you grow."

No, it does not make sense—at least, to me. I do not think it makes sense to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an excellent editorial entitled "The Farmer's Dilemma," and printed in The State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S. C., on April 17, 1956. The editorial points up most clearly some of the problems which the farmers are facing at this time. It is refreshing to see a large daily newspaper take the fair approach to the problem, as The State has done. I take the opportunity to commend this newspaper for its factual representation.

I may say further, Mr. President, that the Columbia State was one of the newspapers which was very fair to General Eisenhower when he campaigned in 1952.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE FARMER'S DILEMMA

The businessman cannot see why the Government should subsidize the farmer and leave him to shift for himself. The farmer is sometimes pictured as living in the lap of luxury, being paid with public funds not to produce or to fill in his losses.

We believe we have mentioned the fact that farmers in this vicinity now say that it is almost impossible to give away a milk cow, the prices being lower than they were in the depths of the depression. We also heard one ex-farmer say he had lost \$50,000 feeding hogs.

Now come two simultaneous magazine articles giving the farmer's point of view. Both are from the Middle West.

Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, who comes in contact with many farmers in his travels over the State and in his office, points out in the American magazine that farm income

in the United States has dropped 9 percent in the last 3 years, and much more in the Southwest, due to droughts and falling cattle prices, with the consequence that many small livestock farmers, including large numbers in southeastern Kansas, have taken outside jobs to feed their families while waiting for a break to better times. Some, however, have sold their farms.

He points out, as was done in our columns some time ago, the large original investment necessary to set up farming. He cites one farmer in eastern Kansas whose 160-acre farm is worth \$25,000 with \$15,000 tied up in machinery. From this \$40,000 investment and a 48-hour workweek he earned a net of \$4,500 in 1947, his best year, but only \$2,500 in 1955, for a 10-year average of \$3,000, or about \$60 a week. His housing would cost \$1,000 a year in town and he saves probably \$500 in food bills from his garden and chickens. But they do not come up to the interest he loses by having his money invested in a farm. At 4 percent it would bring him \$1,600 a year without work. His brother, with no investment nor business ulcers, makes more than \$100 a week in 40 hours as a carpenter. A former schoolmate makes \$90 a week driving an oil truck.

He goes on to point out that we no longer live in a completely free economy. Nearly every segment of the industrial population benefits directly or indirectly from heavy Government spending and has been since early 1940, when the Nation went on an artificial wartime economy which has continued through the cold war. Uncle Sam is pouring out billions to industry for defense purposes, only a small trickle of which sifts down to the farmer. Farmers, he says, will continue to insist on direct Federal aid so long as industry is subsidized. He quotes a State representative who operates a 300-acre farm as saying farmers would be willing to go back to a free enterprise if the rest of the country would, but can't be the only free enterprisers in a controlled economy.

Many Western wheat farmers, he says, would like to have a two-price system, raising all they could without restrictions, guaranteed a good price for the portion needed for normal American consumption and granted the right to store the surplus on their own farms as a hedge against future poor crops or for sale at whatever prices they could get on foreign or domestic markets.

Many also say they need Federal loans to help them buy more land, machinery, and fertilizers if they are ever to get out of their low returns to decent income levels.

An even more discouraging picture is painted by a farm housewife from near Columbia, Mo., Winifred Bryan Horner, in the Saturday Evening Post for April 14. She says that while farm income has dropped 38 percent since 1947, nonfarm income has gone up 68 percent.

Her husband, an agricultural college graduate, built up a sizable operation. But in 1951 things began getting tough till they were trying to figure out a budget on an income of minus \$2,000 a year. Her husband got a job outside, first in air conditioning, "the mechanical approach" to the weather, as Mrs. Horner wittily remarks, and then as a meteorologist, "the scientific approach," still unable to escape the weather. He works 40 hours a week on his job and 40 on the farm. This, we figure, leaves 88 hours a week, or 12.5 hours a day for sleep, eating, recreation and the rest of it.

With expenses increasing, the water problem critical, income decreasing, indebtedness mounting, Mrs. Horner wonders, as her title puts it, "How Long Can We Stay on the Farm?"

Apparently, the same general situation prevails throughout the land. We can't run all farmers out of business and still eat and wear the same kinds of clothes. The farm problem concerns everyone.



# PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESOURCES—THE SOIL BANK PLAN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of 44 of my colleagues and myself, I have today introduced a bill providing for the soil bank plan which was referred to by the President in his veto message and his address to the Nation on the 16th of this month. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to communicate with all the Members of the Senate to ascertain whether they desired to be cosponsors of the bill; I simply spoke with all Senators whom I had time to meet, and there were 44 of them.

The bill is, in effect, title II of the bill which was vetoed by the President, together with the perfecting amendments and the prepayment provisions recommended by the President.

Congress already is deeply aware of the significance of the proposed legislation, the urgency of its enactment, and the need for action now, with the least possible legislative maneuvering and hearings.

Inasmuch as the subject has already had months of intensive congressional study and has already received the support of a large majority of the Members of Congress only a short time ago, there can now be no valid reason for delaying its passage any longer.

The bill could have been enacted at the end of February or early in March, so that it would have been fully effective in implementing farm income, reducing farm surpluses to proper size, and bringing farm production into line with requirements this year. However, that was not done. The bill was delayed, and cannot be fully effective, of course, in this crop year.

Nevertheless, the combining of the soil bank provisions of the bill with the prepayment feature, which has now been included in the bill, will permit prompt payments to be made to the farmers this crop year—the year 1956 has been retained in the bill—and there is no doubt that if the bill can be passed promptly, substantial assistance will accrue to the farmers this year.

Therefore, we who are endorsing the measure join with the President in urging that no further delay be permitted.

As I have said, a great many of my colleagues have joined in introducing the measure. It is evidence of our earnest conviction that swift action is imperative, and is indicative of our sincere desire to cooperate fully with the President in producing immediately an instrument which will attack at the roots the problem of agricultural surpluses.

I believe I can say on behalf of every Senator who has joined in sponsoring the bill that it is our hope, and it will be our combined effort to make certain, that action will be taken by the committee and by Congress as quickly as possible. The bill has already been thoroughly considered and has been approved by a great majority of the Members of Congress; so it should be possible, without any delay, to send to the President a workable, sound soil-bank and forestry program.

It is likewise my hope that, since the proposed legislation has had such thorough consideration and study, there will be no substantial tendency on the part of Senators generally to amend the bill. Such efforts could result in additional unfortunate, harmful delays to the measures. I presume that such efforts would be futile, since most of the amendments which might be proposed have already been considered and rejected either by Congress or by the President himself.

I remind the Senate that the soil-bank provision was not in serious controversy. We can have the bill on the President's desk within a week if we wish to do so. If we want to delay it, I suppose there are those who are in a position to impede it further. But the bill can be on the President's desk within a week if we wish to act promptly. If we do, the farmers of the Nation will receive substantial benefits from it this year.

The farmers need help now. The President has already signified his willingness and his desire to approve the soil-bank measure. In these circumstances, I find no reason why Congress should withhold immediate favorable action; and such action, I think, and I feel certain a large majority of the Senate agree with me, must be forthcoming.

Mr. President, with the introduction of the bill, an opportunity is afforded to place promptly on the President's desk a sound, workable soil-bank program.

If there is delay in action on the bill, I hope those responsible for the delay will be willing to accept full responsibility for holding down the income of the farmers of the country this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I am very pleased to cosponsor the bill described by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and also a bill introduced today by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which are designed to create a soil bank for the farmers of America. I have a particular interest in these proposals. It was almost exactly 2 years ago that I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives calling for the establishment of a soil fertility bank. My bill was introduced on April 15, 1954. A few days later, on the 7th of May, I appeared as a witness before the House Committee on Agriculture. During those hearings I characterized the soil bank in these words:

I believe this approach to the problems of adjusting farm production to effective demand holds much promise. Certainly it is far better to store fertility in the soil than to produce crops beyond market need.

I believed in the principles of the soil bank in 1954. Today, 2 years later, I still believe in these principles. The soil bank plan that would be created under the provisions of the bills I have cosponsored today holds much promise for the future welfare and benefit of the American farmer. But we cannot wish the soil bank into existence. We must take legislative action.

I am certain the overwhelming majority of my colleagues realize the problems that face agriculture today. We have heard speech after speech, outlining the situation and defining the extent of

the agricultural problem. Now it is time for us to act. Now it is time to substitute the helping hand for the worried tongue. Now it is time to demonstrate to the farmer that our concern for his welfare, so often the subject of our Senate speeches, is also the object of our specific legislative action.

I sincerely hope these bills will not become mired in the quicksand of partisan considerations. Most of us realize the farmer has a problem. Most of us believe the soil bank will go a long way toward solving that problem. Let us now put those two considerations together and put our legislative shoulders to the wheel. The farmers deserve this help.

## RECESS TO 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of April 9), 1956.

### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

### To be captains

Abagis, Kenneth M., O71433.  
Abele, Louis E., O59231.  
Abt, Frederick T., O70244.  
Adams, Charles M., O59126.  
Adams, Earl R., Jr., O58288.  
Adams, Pritchard G., Jr., O60248.  
Adkins, Virgil S., Jr., O59987.  
Allen, Boyde W., Jr., O59203.  
Allen, Robert A., O59986.  
Alloway, Curtis H., O59772.  
Alter, George M., O58290.  
Alvarez, Theodore P., O60787.  
Anderegg, Harold R., O59281.  
Anders, Curtis L., O59302.  
Andreen, Robert B., O59149.  
Ankley, William J., O65259.  
Appel, Edward J., O60846.  
Armour, Thomas M., O65281.  
Armstrong, Andrew J., O61102.  
Armstrong, Frank H., O60273.  
Arnette, John Q., O59418.  
Bailey, Horace E., O65230.  
Ballou, DeForrest, 3d, O58299.  
Balmer, Jesmond D., Jr., O59219.  
Bamford, Thomas F., O59166.  
Barclay, Kenneth K., O65285.  
Barlow, Raymon C., Jr., O59287.  
Barnes, Metullus A., Jr., O58302.

- Barry, Clarence D., O58303.  
 Baskin, Ronald R., O70264.  
 Battreall, Raymond R., Jr., O59108.  
 Baumann, Lewis R., O62808.  
 Bayard, Louis P., O59097.  
 Becker, Henry C., Jr., O63389.  
 Bell, Cleo O., O65190.  
 Bell, Clyde B., Jr., O59227.  
 Bender, John A., O59317.  
 Bercaw, Woodson W., Jr., O59077.  
 Berens, Robert J., O58306.  
 Bernard, Carl F., O69589.  
 Bernhard, Alexander H., O63419.  
 Bertholf, Cheney L., Jr., O65202.  
 Betts, Earl C., O59300.  
 Betts, Edward E., O65950.  
 Birrell, John H., O59147.  
 Bivens, Courtland C., Jr., O62537.  
 Black, George S., O65953.  
 Black, Robert W., O59350.  
 Black, William L., O63412.  
 Blackmore, Robert P., O59473.  
 Blake, Thomas B., O58311.  
 Blankenship, Alan W., O60125.  
 Boland, Herman T., Jr., O59092.  
 Bolen, Charles M., Jr., O63417.  
 Bolte, David E., O59307.  
 Bonwell, Donald R., O59297.  
 Bounds, Marcellus W., O59262.  
 Boyes, John H., O65269.  
 Bracey, Spencer M., O58317.  
 Bradley, Robert L., O59244.  
 Braunstein, Howard H., O65196.  
 Breitenberg, Eugene H., O62819.  
 Brian, Adrian B., O59332.  
 Brister, Alan A., O5742.  
 Brockmyer, James J., O63401.  
 Brower, Wesley H., O58320.  
 Brown, Latham H., O58321.  
 Bruce, Wesley D., Jr., O70289.  
 Brunkhorst, Harold H., O58324.  
 Buchanan, John O., O58846.  
 Buck, James H., O62845.  
 Buckingham, Clay T., O59247.  
 Bull, Kenneth R., O60895.  
 Bunch, James E., O58325.  
 Bundy, Richard N., O59169.  
 Burns, Robert J., O65258.  
 Burt, Thomas H., O59416.  
 Bush, Louis S., O59264.  
 Butler, Donald A., O59909.  
 Butler, James F., O65960.  
 Byrd, Roy T., O59415.  
 Calhoun, Leon J., O65613.  
 Campbell, James G., Jr., O58330.  
 Campbell, Robert M., O65736.  
 Caraplis, Louis A., Jr., O58980.  
 Carlisle, Wilford B., O65069.  
 Carr, John L., O59206.  
 Carrigan, Mark C., O63414.  
 Carswell, Bruce MacD., O59132.  
 Carter, Robert P., O63396.  
 Carty, Robert T., O65188.  
 Casper, Richard F., O58331.  
 Cave, Edmund H., O59411.  
 Cayce, Bryce T., O65189.  
 Cerny, Edward V., O59845.  
 Chabot, Richard C., O69616.  
 Chadbourne, James F., Jr., O65962.  
 Chamberlain, Donald E., O60823.  
 Chandler, David J., O59271.  
 Chandler, John P., O59095.  
 Christensen, Hal S., O63420.  
 Christianson, J. Milton, O65965.  
 Church, William M., O58336.  
 Clark, James M., O58338.  
 Clark, Warren M., O65294.  
 Clarke, Frank P., O59144.  
 Clayton, Charles C., O60852.  
 Clineinst, Clinton R., O65225.  
 Cloud, James C., O65743.  
 Coates, Norman W., O69623.  
 Coatney, Loren C., O58340.  
 Cobb, Joseph F., O59990.  
 Coghlan, James J., Jr., O59342.  
 Cohn, Frank, O58341.  
 Cohn, Merrill R., O58342.  
 Cole, Grady A., O58343.  
 Collins, John J., Jr., O65243.  
 Collins, Thomas E., O69624.  
 Connell, Richard M., O59098.  
 Conner, Judson J., O59242.  
 Cook, Robert E., O60162.  
 Corcoran, Edward F., O65239.  
 Cordova, William R., O70308.  
 Cory, Rennie M., O65207.  
 Costa, John J., O59112.  
 Costen, Charles B., O58350.  
 Couch, Roy E., O58351.  
 Coughlin, Thomas B., O59323.  
 Council, Ronald D., O59179.  
 Covell, Charles R., O58284.  
 Cox, Cleatus J., O59243.  
 Craig, Richard S., O59401.  
 Creel, Elmonac V., O65238.  
 Croonquist, Henry T., O59152.  
 Crowley, Edwin K., Jr., O65614.  
 Crozier, Ted A., O70317.  
 Custer, George A., O58356.  
 Dabbs, Ralph T., O65244.  
 Davis, Dan W., O60854.  
 Davis, Harold O., O60242.  
 Davis, Ovid M., O58360.  
 Davis, Preston A., O58361.  
 Day, Bartley E., O59201.  
 Day, Seth S., O59288.  
 Dearing, John W., O65201.  
 de Correvont, Leon L., O59258.  
 Deeley, William R., O65977.  
 DeFiori, Victor A., O71667.  
 DeLoach, William M., O59978.  
 Denend, William L., O58365.  
 Denham, Ernest W., Jr., O59373.  
 de Rusha, Richard A., O63416.  
 Dibrell, Jack H., O65979.  
 DiCiro, Charles M., O59991.  
 Dickerson, Paul J., O58368.  
 Dickinson, Dean B., O59160.  
 Dickinson, Hillman, O59090.  
 Diehl, Robert C., O65980.  
 DiGennaro, Michael A., Jr., O65497.  
 Dilts, Andrew S., O59353.  
 Dittamore, Rex T., O70326.  
 Dixon, Ralph P., Jr., O58371.  
 Dodd, Stephen F., O58372.  
 Doherty, Richard J., O58373.  
 Doiron, Henry D., O57850.  
 Donohoe, Patrick J., O59102.  
 Dorsey, Ralph M., O63394.  
 Driscoll, Arthur R., Jr., O59228.  
 Dunn, John M., O65252.  
 Dunphy, Richard T., O59392.  
 DuRant, Billy C., O58376.  
 Duray, Joseph E., O65257.  
 Dye, Clarence C., O58377.  
 Eagers, Joseph A., Jr., O59367.  
 East, Charles M., Jr., O70329.  
 Ednie, Robert L., O60243.  
 Edwards, Henry B., Jr., O58130.  
 Eichelsdoerfer, Howard H., O60718.  
 Emery, John R., O59992.  
 Emery, Thomas D., O69640.  
 Engle, Marshall G., O65747.  
 English, Allan J., Jr., O59316.  
 Erbe, Robert L., O59196.  
 Estes, Robert K., O59187.  
 Evans, Alexander R., O65494.  
 Evans, Bryan, Jr., O58897.  
 Evans, Thomas C., O58382.  
 Faistenhammer, Ludwig, Jr., O65249.  
 Falkenbury, Stephen D., Jr., O59508.  
 Fallon, Robert T., O59239.  
 Fancher, Paul T., O65205.  
 Farnsworth, John A., O65612.  
 Fatum, John J., O59380.  
 Fay, Dean W., O65746.  
 Feir, Philip R., O59189.  
 Ferguson, James W., O59659.  
 Finnegan, Marcus B., O59109.  
 Fischman, Kurt, O65744.  
 Fisher, Robert W., O58386.  
 Fitz, Harold C., Jr., O59159.  
 Flagg, Austin T., O58387.  
 Fleri, Paul C., Jr., O59251.  
 Florio, John D., O63398.  
 Fluckey, Wallace N., O58389.  
 Foley, John J., Jr., O65209.  
 Ford, Earl P., O59233.  
 Ford, Edward A., O70338.  
 Ford, George L., Jr., O58391.  
 Forrest, John P., O59269.  
 Francis, Charles S., O65254.  
 Frandsen, Donald P., O58396.  
 Frandsen, Oscar R., O58397.  
 Fraser, Carlos L., O65495.  
 Freeman, Belvin S., O69649.  
 Freeman, David G., O59393.  
 Fuller, Marvin D., O59993.  
 Fullerton, Avery S., O59124.  
 Gappa, Casimer S., O58401.  
 Garber, Robert A., O65277.  
 Garcia, Oscar M., O58402.  
 Garitty, Lyle J., Jr., O58403.  
 Garner, Francis, O65268.  
 Garofalo, William E., O63409.  
 Garties, Richard G., O71347.  
 Gentile, Paul J., O63415.  
 Geohagan, Hilton E., O65233.  
 Gess, Robert H., O59188.  
 Gibbs, Marvin H., O58405.  
 Gibson, Joseph T., O59184.  
 Giglio, Rudolph F. L., O63399.  
 Gillespie, Berkley S., Jr., O59829.  
 Gillespie, Richard E., O59172.  
 Gilliat, Donald L., O59994.  
 Gilroy, Robert J., O59355.  
 Godfrey, Carl F., O58410.  
 Goessling, Ward C., Jr., O59224.  
 Good, Robert E., O59995.  
 Goodwin, William H., O59195.  
 Gordanier, Robert S., O65256.  
 Gordon, William L., O59996.  
 Gower, Donald N., O59246.  
 Graves, Francis P., Jr., O60252.  
 Gray, Homer E., Jr., O65198.  
 Gray, John E., O58411.  
 Green, Charles E., O70347.  
 Greenbaum, Bernard, O59141.  
 Greene, Raul L., O68006.  
 Greer, Robert W., O59983.  
 Gregg, John B., O59825.  
 Grieger, Allen J., O61088.  
 Griffith, Harry A., O59089.  
 Groves, Thurman M., O65270.  
 Guelzo, Carl M., O58416.  
 Haden, Clinton B., O65177.  
 Hale, Alfred B., O59217.  
 Hall, Allen K., O58421.  
 Hall, Reginald W., O65741.  
 Hallman, Thomas J., O59997.  
 Hammel, Richard L., O61087.  
 Hammes, Norman W., O70360.  
 Hammonds, Eugene, O65179.  
 Hampton, Kenneth R., O59982.  
 Harkins, Donald E., O65217.  
 Harpold, Harry H., Jr., O66008.  
 Harrington, James L., O65221.  
 Harrington, Lonnie E., Jr., O57681.  
 Harris, Richard E., O59979.  
 Harris, Ronald V., O69670.  
 Harrison, Oscar J., O58428.  
 Hassman, Phillip E., O59972.  
 Hathaway, Thomas C., Jr., O58429.  
 Hayes, Duane, O58430.  
 Hayes, John G., O66160.  
 Hayes Joseph W., Jr., O66012.  
 Hayne, Jack R., O59362.  
 Healy, Michael D., O70368.  
 Hefti, James C., O59330.  
 Heiden, Charles K., O59117.  
 Heller, Thomas J., O57924.  
 Henderson, Glenn H., O69674.  
 Henderson, Hubert H., Jr., O70373.  
 Hendricks, Meredith E., O59129.  
 Herbert, James M., Jr., O60159.  
 Herve, Theodore E., O59208.  
 Heyer, Charles J., O60245.  
 Hickey, Pennell J., O59361.  
 Hiestand, William C., O59113.  
 Hilburn, Jack B., O65224.  
 Hill, Robert W., O65227.  
 Hillyer, William J., O65739.  
 Hindman, Edward R., O59114.  
 Hjorth, George E., O58440.  
 Hodes, John T., O59261.  
 Hoffman, William H., O59279.  
 Hoffmaster, George C., Jr., O59222.  
 Holloway, Kenneth H., O58441.  
 Holt, James H., O59185.  
 Hoot, Herbert L., Jr., O59292.  
 Hopkins, Norman B., Jr., O59385.  
 Horey, Robert L., O58442.  
 Howard, Edward B., O59223.  
 Howell, Martin D., O59181.  
 Hubbard, Jack A., O71370.



- Huber, Leo K., O59250.  
 Huber, William E., O59088.  
 Hughes, Billy D., O65236.  
 Hughes, James E., O58444.  
 Hughes, James E. Jr., O58445.  
 Hull, James M., O65733.  
 Hunt, John E., Jr., O65745.  
 Huntzinger, Harvey W., O70387.  
 Hussey, John W., O59999.  
 Hynes, Joseph D., O63390.  
 Irish, Wilfred E., Jr., O65271.  
 Ivey, Benjamin F., Jr., O58448.  
 Jacobs, Winston R., O58449.  
 Jacques, Jasper P., O65180.  
 James, Charles A. 3d, O60000.  
 Janasiewicz, Thadeus S., O65266.  
 Jartman, Marc R., O59253.  
 Jenkins, Willie H., Jr., O62809.  
 Jensen, Hubert J., O58452.  
 Jensen, Reed G., O59358.  
 Johnson, Lawrence H., Jr., O69702.  
 Johnson, Maurice A., Jr., O65262.  
 Johnson, Robert J., O59357.  
 Johnson, Ross LeR., O59176.  
 Johnson, Thomas L., O58453.  
 Jones, Clinton K., O70394.  
 Jones, Douglas C., O58454.  
 Jones, George M. D., O58456.  
 Jones, Ogden S., Jr., O59237.  
 Jones, Philip D., O70395.  
 Joyce, Marlon D., O65229.  
 Judd, James J., O69704.  
 Jurgens, Francis M., O70397.  
 Kapec, Andrew J., O62278.  
 Keith, Donald R., O59170.  
 Kemble, Charles R., O59143.  
 Kennedy, Neal D., O58463.  
 Kennedy, William J., O59235.  
 Key, Milton E., O58464.  
 King, John E., O69712.  
 King, Lemuel G., O58465.  
 King, Melvin E., O59661.  
 Kingdom, Arthur J., O59202.  
 Kinghorn, Alan, O66175.  
 Kingston, Joseph P., O59386.  
 Kinne, Harold C., Jr., O61212.  
 Kirby, Gilbert W., Jr., O59134.  
 Kirk, Richard L., O65276.  
 Kirk, Robert J., O59974.  
 Kitlas, Albert C., O58466.  
 Klim, Henry L., O60458.  
 Knapp, Theron W., Jr., O59186.  
 Knippling, Louis H., Jr., O58467.  
 Koeckert, William F., O69715.  
 Kolster, Jim H., O65265.  
 Kooker, Donald E., Jr., O70403.  
 Kostka, Bohuslav Z., O65611.  
 Koziel, Richard J., O65235.  
 Krasko, John, O59406.  
 Krstulich, Karl J., O65251.  
 Kuefler, Kenneth T., O59493.  
 Kuntze, Robert A., O65203.  
 Kurtz, Maurice K., Jr., O59107.  
 Lamar, Kirby, O59257.  
 Lambert, Robert O., O63400.  
 Lamp, Russell J., O59115.  
 Lampros, James L., O59283.  
 Landis, Charles M., O65193.  
 Landre, Lowell H., O66035.  
 Landseadel, Robert J., Jr., O65496.  
 Lansing, Ernest J., O63113.  
 LaPorte, Arthur E., Jr., O58472.  
 Larsen, Narian G., O58473.  
 Larson, Gale L., O65185.  
 Larson, Lyle R., O65218.  
 Lauber, Robert W., O58475.  
 Lauer, Jerry B., O59164.  
 Lawrence, Douglas M., O65275.  
 Laysen, John D., Jr., O59507.  
 Lee, Charles B., O59305.  
 Legg, Elbert E., O58477.  
 LeGro, William E., Jr., O67837.  
 Lehner, Charles E., Jr., O59241.  
 Leister, James W., O65738.  
 Leneten, Charles C., Jr., O63114.  
 Lentini, Anthony R., O58479.  
 LeTillier, Carroll N., O60118.  
 Lewis, Addison L., O65216.  
 Lewis, Malcolm K., O59234.  
 Lewis, Murray M., O66036.  
 Lewis, Samuel A., O65191.  
 Liffiton, William T., O65248.  
 Litchow, Robert E., O59174.  
 Lind, Thomas D., O58483.  
 Lindeman, Arthur H., Jr., O59177.  
 Lippincott, John C., O65732.  
 Little, Robert A., O70409.  
 Livingston, Leon R., Jr., O58487.  
 Lochhead, Earl J., O59336.  
 Lombard, Harold F., O59205.  
 Lombardi, Arthur P., O69730.  
 Long, Eldredge R., Jr., O58122.  
 Long, Homer S., Jr., O59158.  
 Love, Richard M., O67717.  
 Lowrey, Willis H., O59148.  
 Luebbert, William F., O59096.  
 Lynch, Hugh J., O60001.  
 Lynch, Robert E., O59893.  
 Lynch, Robert O., O59346.  
 Macatee, William F., O58491.  
 Mack, Richard E., O58492.  
 MacKenzie, Thomas R., O59119.  
 Mackert, John R., O59146.  
 MacNeill, Francis W., O70416.  
 Madison, John H., Jr., O59212.  
 Maggio, Christopher S., O59975.  
 Magnotti, John F., Jr., O59200.  
 Malhafer, Harry J., O59167.  
 Mallory, Phillip L., O59769.  
 Marder, Eugene, O62807.  
 Mariconda, Alexander F., O59984.  
 Marley, John T., O59314.  
 Marshall, Francis R., O58496.  
 Martin, Stuart F., O59368.  
 Mathews, Amos C., O59104.  
 Mathews, Wayne C., O70422.  
 Maurer, John A., O59225.  
 Mautz, Wayne A., O65228.  
 Mayer, Arthur J., O59221.  
 Mayer, Jack, O60240.  
 McAfee, Glen R., O63410.  
 McAloon, James J., O65263.  
 McArdle, John F., O59135.  
 McCarron, Dean J., O59218.  
 McCarthy, James L., O58502.  
 McClaran, Jack L., O70425.  
 McClenaghan, Robert S., O65283.  
 McClure, Bruce, O65211.  
 McClure, George W., Jr., O58504.  
 McConaghy, David D., O58506.  
 McCrary, Charles E., O58507.  
 McCrary, Earl C., O70426.  
 McCulloch, Robert C., O60723.  
 McGarey, Richard V., O58508.  
 McGinnis, Charles I., O58509.  
 McGowan, Edgar, O63404.  
 McGuinn, Michael E., 3d, O65734.  
 McIntosh, James F., O65210.  
 McIntosh, Robert B., Jr., O62006.  
 McIntyre, Kenneth E., O59087.  
 Mears, Joe G., O66052.  
 Medsger, Gerald W., O57080.  
 Meek, Carroll S., O59274.  
 Melner, Sinclair L., O58513.  
 Mesick, Robert A., O60610.  
 Messer, Melvin, O69744.  
 Messinger, Lucien E., 3d, O59294.  
 Metzger, J. Hayes, O59340.  
 Miller, Charles F., O65222.  
 Miller, Robert C., O59303.  
 Miller, Rowlan L., O58517.  
 Mitchell, John D., Jr., O59116.  
 Moller, Andreas J., O58520.  
 Monahan, Lawrence P., Jr., O59190.  
 Moon, Virgil C., O61132.  
 Moore, James T., O58522.  
 Moore, Merl M., Jr., O58523.  
 Moore, William T., O59120.  
 Moran, Clayton L., O59298.  
 Moreau, Donald W., O69752.  
 Morgan, Ernest H., O65260.  
 Morgan, Rex S., O59496.  
 Morley, Richard H., O65250.  
 Morris, Charles E., O65206.  
 Morris, David O'N., O69753.  
 Morrissey, John J., O70439.  
 Morton, Richard L., O59313.  
 Moses, Thomas L., O59280.  
 Motola, Mario V., O63406.  
 Muckerman, Joseph E., 2d, O59356.  
 Muenker, James E., O59497.  
 Mullens, Robert M., O65246.  
 Mullins, Orbra G., O63353.  
 Munn, Richard A., Jr., O59461.  
 Murphy, Edward L., Jr., O58527.  
 Murray, Clive E., Jr., O58529.  
 Myers, William G., O59658.  
 Nath, Robert E., O60002.  
 Nell, James M., O59101.  
 Nelson, Knute R., O61220.  
 Nelson, Neil G., O59660.  
 Nelson, Robert B., O59211.  
 Nelson, Robert C., O59091.  
 Nelson, Wallace W., O69757.  
 Nelson, William J., O58532.  
 Newell, Arthur, O69533.  
 Nielsen, Jack W., O58534.  
 Nikas, Nick J., O67733.  
 Nix, Charles E., O61137.  
 Noce, Robert W., O59175.  
 Norcom, Henry C., O70455.  
 Nordin, William H., O59137.  
 Norman, William C., O59296.  
 Norris, Charles J., O65255.  
 Norton, Dunbar S., O65199.  
 Norwalk, John W., O59833.  
 Nowak, George A., O58539.  
 Nulsen, Charles K., Jr., O59260.  
 Nunnally, Stephens W., O59110.  
 Nyquist, Joel B., Jr., O65107.  
 Oberst, Tom C., O59178.  
 O'Brien, Richard E., O65187.  
 O'Brien, Robert T., O59136.  
 Odom, Louie W., O65231.  
 Ogden, Lawrence J., O59372.  
 Olentine, Charles G., O59125.  
 Olson, Robert E., O58542.  
 Ormes, Sidney E., Jr., O58544.  
 Osato, Timothy, O60241.  
 Owsley, Homer, Jr., O59498.  
 Pack, Charles R., O60160.  
 Padalino, Martin L., O70463.  
 Page, James MacM., Jr., O70465.  
 Palmer, Charles D., O59348.  
 Palmer, Richard A., O58546.  
 Panzer, Dwayne A., O58547.  
 Parr, Bertram L., O69766.  
 Patrick, Stephen J., Jr., O69538.  
 Patterson, Loren S., O59309.  
 Paulson, Paul A., O59318.  
 Pelxotto, Roland E., O59263.  
 Pence, Edward W., O58552.  
 Perfect, Burns I., O70470.  
 Peters, Elmer B., O59198.  
 Petranck, John J., O59236.  
 Peyton, Dallas M., Jr., O65186.  
 Pfeffer, William J., O60593.  
 Phillips, Eugene, Jr., O65242.  
 Poerner, Homer W., O65219.  
 Pollin, George A., Jr., O59168.  
 Post, Sterling T., Jr., O67855.  
 Powell, Roger D., O58560.  
 Powers, Terence A., O59286.  
 Prather, Lewis D., O69772.  
 Price, Wallace W., O65030.  
 Price, Wilbur F., O60847.  
 Price, William S., O65247.  
 Prichard, Chesley D., O58562.  
 Proctor, William B., Jr., O58563.  
 Prout, William L., O59977.  
 Puckett, Ralph, Jr., O59165.  
 Pugh, Albert S., 3d, O66074.  
 Quigley, Quentin D., O60909.  
 Rafferty, Arthur J., O58566.  
 Rank, William A., O59099.  
 Rasmussen, John W., Jr., O59193.  
 Rasmussen, Raymond J., O59161.  
 Rast, Jim F., O60117.  
 Ray, John L., O58570.  
 Ream, Forrest D., O59503.  
 Reiner, Raphael A., O70487.  
 Rennie, John C. G., O59767.  
 Rhodes, Clifford D., O65589.  
 Rice, William H., O69776.  
 Rich, Charles E., O70489.  
 Riddle, Hugh H., O66194.  
 Rives, James C., O61138.  
 Roberts, Ernst E., O59229.  
 Roebuck, Charles G., O59154.  
 Rogers, David B., Jr., O59341.  
 Rohde, Lynn O., O65278.  
 Rocks, David L., O63391.  
 Rose, Robert M., O59127.  
 Ross, Edgar B., Jr., O59220.

Ross, Marion C., O59273.  
 Rowan, Elwyn P., O59407.  
 Rowe, Gordon D., O58583.  
 Royal, Everett C., O58584.  
 Russell, David C., O62279.  
 Ruzich, Rudolph L., O65178.  
 Ryan, Charles L., Jr., O60004.  
 Sadler, Jack R., O59081.  
 Sanders, Robert C., O59272.  
 Sarsfield, Francis L., O59312.  
 Savage, Paul L., O58589.  
 Scherer, John W., O66093.  
 Scheumann, Marcus C., Jr., O66094.  
 Schmalzel, Joseph L., Jr., O59252.  
 Schmidt, Norbert O., O59123.  
 Schoen, Harry P., Jr., O60848.  
 Schulz, Gerhard W., O59121.  
 Schungel, Daniel F., O65286.  
 Schwarz, Robert H., O59310.  
 Sedlacek, LeRoy V., O65272.  
 Seibert, Donald W., O63413.  
 Selby, Lewis S., O63402.  
 Semmens, Gervies L., O59976.  
 Semsch, Philip L., O58596.  
 Shaw, Harold E., O58600.  
 Sheets, Henry B., Jr., O59268.  
 Sheldon, Dwight MacF., O58601.  
 Shelnut, James R., O60725.  
 Shelton, Louis H., O58602.  
 Sherblom, Harry G., O65284.  
 Sherman, Robert, O61101.  
 Shields, Lawrence D., O66097.  
 Sickafoose, Keith E., O59138.  
 Singletary, Albert W., O59180.  
 Singleton, William T., O70504.  
 Smith, Charles L., O59399.  
 Smith, Clayton J., O60005.  
 Smith, Duane H., O59191.  
 Smith, Harold F., Jr., O66101.  
 Smith, James F., Jr., O63422.  
 Smith, Simeon M., Jr., O59338.  
 Smith, Wayne C., Jr., O59382.  
 Snipan, George, O62264.  
 Soucek, Leo E., O60006.  
 Spence, Ralph W., O58145.  
 Spencer, Orton F., O59240.  
 Spettel, Charles L., O59128.  
 Spivey, Ray V., O63489.  
 Spoede, Robert W., O58610.  
 Springer, Robert M., Jr., O59210.  
 Stagner, Clyde H., O65183.  
 Staples, Franklin E., O65616.  
 Stauffer, Joseph R., O59103.  
 Steel, James H., O59324.  
 Steenburn, Donald H., O58614.  
 Sterrett, John D., O59474.  
 Stickley, Douglas P., Jr., O59387.  
 Stockton, Thomas W., O59199.  
 Stone, Warren C., O69807.  
 Strauss, George H., O58618.  
 Streett, St. Clair, Jr., O59163.  
 Strohecker, Howard L., O59084.  
 Struthers, James C., O69809.  
 Stukhart, George, Jr., O59139.  
 Sturdivant, Leslie W., O58620.  
 Sugg, Leon H., Jr., O65226.  
 Summers, George D., O59194.  
 Surut, Lee E., O59150.  
 Suther, Russell J., O58623.  
 Suttle, Albert B., Jr., O59182.  
 Sutton, John E., O59155.  
 Swain, Quentin S., Jr., O65267.  
 Swartz, Stanley P., O63421.  
 Swett, Trevor W., Jr., O59321.  
 Synolds, Donald L., O57670.  
 Tallman, Richard J., O59277.  
 Tataschiere, Joseph W., O65615.  
 Templeman, James M., O60007.  
 Terry, Charles A., O58628.  
 Thacker, Paul R., O59050.  
 Thams, Robert W., O65609.  
 Thoma, William C., O63397.  
 Thomas, Jack D., O59255.  
 Thompson, Donald E., O59226.  
 Thompson, Ward A., O65194.  
 Tice, Raphael D., O70530.  
 Timmerberg, Paul M., O70531.  
 Tobin, Richard E., O59329.  
 Townroe, Frederick M., O63395.  
 Townsley, Edwin S., O59094.  
 Trabue, Earl N., O58635.

Tracy, George W., O59145.  
 Trinkle, Frank W., O65204.  
 Turley, Joseph McL., O59404.  
 Turman, Robert L., O58636.  
 Turnbull, Francis W., O63112.  
 Turner, Albert F., O59293.  
 Turner, Frederick C., Jr., O58637.  
 Turner, Glenn E., Jr., O58638.  
 Twitchell, Blaine E., O606161.  
 Tyler, John E., O70540.  
 Tyson, William P., Jr., O71423.  
 Underwood, Arthur R., Jr., O59370.  
 Unger, Guinn E., O58641.  
 Van Hook, James McN., O59768.  
 Van Meter, Jack D., O65182.  
 Van Patten, Allen E., O65261.  
 Van Sant, Jesse F., O65280.  
 Vargovick, William S., O59285.  
 Vaughn, James B., O65181.  
 Vincent, Caleb R., O60813.  
 Vollmer, John P., O59284.  
 Waddell, Jack L., O66114.  
 Wagner, Richard H., O59122.  
 Walker, Albert L., O58644.  
 Wallace, Bruce E., O65610.  
 Walsh, John J., Jr., O70549.  
 Walters, Edwin S., O58646.  
 Walton, John M., O58647.  
 Walz, Charles, O59216.  
 Warlick, William F., Jr., O65213.  
 Warnke, John J., Jr., O58649.  
 Watling, Edward T., O59506.  
 Watson, Henry, Jr., O71892.  
 Weber, Robert J., O65208.  
 Wellborn, Charles G., Jr., O65273.  
 Wesolowski, Stanley, O58655.  
 West, William F., O58656.  
 Wheelock, Alton R., O59334.  
 Whelan, Raymond A., O69829.  
 Whichard, William A., O65212.  
 Whistler, Donald E., O59204.  
 Whitlock, Thomas D., O65195.  
 Wightman, John D., O59384.  
 Wilkins, Frank E., O63408.  
 Williams, Alton G., O60251.  
 Williams, Edwin J., Jr., O58660.  
 Williams, Murray W., O59197.  
 Williamson, Dan H., Jr., O59173.  
 Williamson, William G., O60010.  
 Wilmot, Fred W., O59770.  
 Wilson, Floyd M., O56663.  
 Wilson, Francis B., O65737.  
 Winn, Charles C., O58664.  
 Wise, William A., 2d, O60855.  
 Withers, Langhorne P., O68062.  
 Wolak, Francis A., O59086.  
 Womble, Phelps R., O66647.  
 Woolshlager, Richard J., O58667.  
 Wren, John J., O58669.  
 Wright, Billy R., O69838.  
 Wright, George, O58670.  
 Wright, William M., O70574.  
 Wyruchowski, Edward P., Jr., O65241.  
 Yacker, Everett J., O59153.  
 Yadon, James C., O58671.  
 Yeats, Joseph J., Jr., O59151.  
 Yellman, Edward K., O59364.  
 Yepsen, John H., O59267.  
 Younger, Ralph K., O58673.  
 Youngren, Arthur W., O65279.  
 Zartner, Bertram L., O67889.  
 Zollicoffer, Marion B., O65184.  
 Zumwalt, Charles B., O58679.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants*

Abbott, Walter H., O68852.  
 Ackerman, Arthur H., O68413.  
 Adams, David G., O68853.  
 Adams, Harold E., O68854.  
 Adamson, George W., O68855.  
 Adee, LeRoy P., O68414.  
 Agather, Frederic G., O68415.  
 Aguilar, William P., O68856.  
 Ain, Milton, O68858.  
 Ainslie, Robert E., O69844.

Albert, Robert J., O68416.  
 Alch, Wayne F., O68417.  
 Alexander, Robert L., O68418.  
 Allebach, Victor L., O70130.  
 Allen, Stanley C., O72809.  
 Alston, Lonnie N., O68860.  
 Ambrose, Thomas J., O71753.  
 Ames, William I., Jr., O68861.  
 Anderson, Benjamin H., Jr., O70160.  
 Anderson, James C., O68863.  
 Anderson, Thurman E., O69847.  
 Andre, Nick J., O68864.  
 Andrews, Edward P., O68419.  
 Andrews, Wilson P., O72813.  
 Angstadt, John P., O68420.  
 Appleton, James L., Jr., O68421.  
 Arduna, Arthur A., O68422.  
 Armstrong, Raymond L., O68867.  
 Arnheim, Rolfe G., O68423.  
 Ash, Philip L., Jr., O68866.  
 Atkinson, Ellis O., Jr., O68869.  
 Atwell, Billy J., O68870.  
 Atwood, John B., O68871.  
 Atwood, Thomas W. W., O68872.  
 Auer, Charles H., O68873.  
 Avveduti, Paul R., O68874.  
 Ayers, Robert E., O68424.  
 Ayers, Theodore F., O68875.  
 Bacey, Algirdas S., O71756.  
 Bailey, Russian B., O68212.  
 Baker, Russell A., Jr., O68425.  
 Balistreri, Leo A., O68876.  
 Ball, Duard D., O68213.  
 Bamberg, James R., O68426.  
 Banks, Douglas T., O68877.  
 Barcelo, Antonio R., O68878.  
 Barnes, Vernon, Jr., O68881.  
 Barnett, Lionel, O68284.  
 Barnett, Walter L., O68214.  
 Barrentine, Charles D., O68883.  
 Barrett, Robert E., O68884.  
 Bartlett, Robert G., O68427.  
 Barton, Robert E., O68428.  
 Basic, Nick J., O72817.  
 Battey, Edward, 3d, O68215.  
 Bauer, Harold E., Jr., O68429.  
 Baughman, Larry J., O71442.  
 Bauman, William F., O68430.  
 Baynard, Richard A., O71641.  
 Beall, George F., O68887.  
 Bean, John F., O68888.  
 Beardsley, William M., O68889.  
 Becker, Donald H., O68431.  
 Beers, John R., O70164.  
 Bell, Robert R., O68890.  
 Bell, William R., O68432.  
 Bellows, Robert E., O68856.  
 Bennett, Lloyd P., O68891.  
 Bennett, William L., O68892.  
 Bentley, Ernest E., Jr., O68893.  
 Benz, Richard A., O68433.  
 Berkey, Ronald R., O71443.  
 Berzinec, William E., O68894.  
 Best, David A., O68434.  
 Bickmore, Jesse O., Jr., O68897.  
 Bidstrup, Graham P., O68435.  
 Biggerstaff, Allan C., O68436.  
 Bigham, Jim C., O68898.  
 Billy, Myron D., O68900.  
 Birchler, Norman W., O68437.  
 Bishop, Edward L. P., O68438.  
 Black, William T., O68904.  
 Blackledge, David W., O68905.  
 Blacklock, Charlie L., O72821.  
 Blanton, Clay E., O71447.  
 Blastos, Constantine J., O68439.  
 Blauvelt, Richard B., O68906.  
 Bledsoe, Roy A., Jr., O69594.  
 Bleecker, James F., O68440.  
 Blocher, Ashley S., O68907.  
 Blottie, Donald L., O70131.  
 Blum, Robert W., O68441.  
 Boggs, Joseph C., O72823.  
 Boggs, William L., O73291.  
 Bohlin, Harry J., O68909.  
 Bolch, Adrian D., Jr., O68910.  
 Bonnett, Thomas J., O68911.  
 Boone, Louis C., Jr., O68442.  
 Boring, Landin F., O68913.  
 Born, Keith L., O68443.  
 Boucher, Leo P., Jr., O68914.



- Bowen, James E., 3d, O68444.  
 Bowers, James M., O68219.  
 Bowers, Richard E., O68915.  
 Boxell, Robert A., O68445.  
 Boyle, Daniel E., O68916.  
 Boyle, Richard D., O68446.  
 Brain, Tom H., O68447.  
 Breckenridge, Robert C., O68448.  
 Brewbaker, Chalmers L., O68450.  
 Brewer, Curtis A., O68451.  
 Brewster, Harold R., O70168.  
 Brewster, Lawrence C., O68917.  
 Bricker, James W., O68918.  
 Bringham, John L. B., O68452.  
 Brinsko, John A., O68453.  
 Brock, Mervin E., O68919.  
 Brogan, Thomas W., O68920.  
 Brooker, Clarence B., Jr., O68221.  
 Brookshire, Grail L., O70133.  
 Brophy, Jeremiah J., O68454.  
 Brosious, George D., O68455.  
 Brotman, Robert, O68921.  
 Brown, Arthur E., Jr., O68456.  
 Brown, Charles W., O68969.  
 Brown, Donald S., O68457.  
 Brown, Elmer A., O68970.  
 Brown, Gerald W., O71766.  
 Brown, Thomas D., O68458.  
 Bruce, Miles E., O68924.  
 Bumbaugh, James W., O68926.  
 Bunting, Wilber J., O68927.  
 Burdeau, Edward K., O68459.  
 Burdeshaw, William B., O68460.  
 Burkhardt, William A., O68461.  
 Burkland, James M., O68462.  
 Burr, Richard A., O68973.  
 Butler, Don A., O72833.  
 Butler, Phillip C., O68929.  
 Butler, Robert E., O68463.  
 Byrnes, Vincent F., Jr., O68931.  
 Byrom, Robert, O68222.  
 Cahill, Philip J., O68792.  
 Caldwell, James K., O68932.  
 Callahan, Bernard L. J., O68934.  
 Callis, Bennie E., O72410.  
 Campbell, George S., O68935.  
 Campbell, James G., O68936.  
 Canedy, Charles E., O68937.  
 Canham, Thomas R., O68464.  
 Cannon, Lee B., Jr., O68223.  
 Canonico, John N., Jr., O68938.  
 Cantrell, Wanford A., O68939.  
 Carbonetti, James A., O68940.  
 Carr, Gordon W., O68941.  
 Carr, John C., O68942.  
 Carrillo, Armando E., O68944.  
 Carter, Robert A., O68465.  
 Carter, Sidney W., O68466.  
 Caruso, John P., O68945.  
 Cash, William McK., O68946.  
 Cassidy, Thomas K., O68947.  
 Cates, Arthur J., O68467.  
 Catudal, Joseph U., O70080.  
 Ceglowski, John P., O68468.  
 Chabot, Don W., O73063.  
 Chaffin, Jimmie M., O68948.  
 Chaffin, Leonard D., O68811.  
 Chambers, Earl L., O68469.  
 Charlton, James S., O68812.  
 Cheves, Charles J., Jr., O68470.  
 Childs, John O., O70174.  
 Ching, Harry L. F., O68949.  
 Chojnowski, Milton A., O68471.  
 Chomko, Gene N., O68813.  
 Christian, James A., O68950.  
 Christman, Daniel P., O68472.  
 Churchill, Johnny J., O68334.  
 Cipriani, Lawrence J., O68951.  
 Clark, David R., O68952.  
 Clark, Gene E., O68954.  
 Clarke, William T., O68955.  
 Clift, Milton L., O68956.  
 Cochran, Reubin W., O68474.  
 Coffey, Vernon C., Jr., O71463.  
 Cole, William A., O68475.  
 Coleman, George E., Jr., O68957.  
 Coleman, James P., O68884.  
 Collier, Alvis W., O68958.  
 Collins, Ashby F., O68959.  
 Collinsworth, Coy M., O68226.  
 Colonna, Gary S., O68476.  
 Colson, Alfred B., Jr., O68987.  
 Colson, James B., Jr., O68960.  
 Colvin, William R., O68477.  
 Comer, Ralph L., O68961.  
 Conder, Raymond C., Jr., O68478.  
 Connell, Charles R., 3d, O68962.  
 Conover, Nelson P., O70082.  
 Conway, Edward S., O68964.  
 Conzelman, Peter S., O68479.  
 Cook, Robert C., Jr., O68988.  
 Cooper, John H., O68480.  
 Cooper, John O., 3d, O68481.  
 Cordill, Richard W., O68482.  
 Corpew, Gerald W., O68483.  
 Cottingham, John B., Jr., O68966.  
 Coughlin, Charles L., O68989.  
 Cousland, Walter C., O68484.  
 Coverdale, Craig G., O68485.  
 Cox, Edwin, O68967.  
 Cragun, Benjamin M., O68968.  
 Craig, Robert B., O71775.  
 Craighead, Doyle T., O68990.  
 Craver, Roger H., O72330.  
 Creighton, Neal, O68486.  
 Crerar, John H., 2d, O68487.  
 Crevoiserat, Laurence W., O68488.  
 Crim, William T., O68489.  
 Cristan, Anthony F., O68969.  
 Crosby, Robert L., O68490.  
 Cross, George M., O68970.  
 Crouch, Roby E., Jr., O68971.  
 Crowell, William B., O68972.  
 Crown, Ray H., O70083.  
 Curran, Gordon A., O68491.  
 Currie, James A., O68492.  
 Currier, Eugene R., O68493.  
 Daggett, Robert W., O73312.  
 Daggit, Edward A., O68494.  
 Dahl, Bruce E., O68995.  
 Daly, Robert F., O68495.  
 Dammicci, Anthony E., O68973.  
 Dancause, Philip T., O68974.  
 Daniels, Tolbert A., Jr., O68975.  
 Daniels, Walter C., O68976.  
 Dare, James T., O68496.  
 Davis, Dale E., O68497.  
 Davis, Donald F., O68498.  
 Davis, Edward E., O73315.  
 Davis, Edwin G., O71477.  
 Davis, Lauren S., O68499.  
 Davis, Richard R., O68500.  
 Davis, Robley W., Jr., O68978.  
 Davis, Thomas C., O68501.  
 Davis, Willys E., O68815.  
 Davison, Henry L., Jr., O68502.  
 Dawson, Earl N., Jr., O68979.  
 Dawson, Kenneth E., Jr., O68503.  
 Dawson, Wallace H., 3d, O71779.  
 Day, Robert G., O68504.  
 Dean, Frank M. S., O70084.  
 Delahanty, Raymond A., Jr., O68981.  
 Delbridge, Norman G., Jr., O68505.  
 Del Santo, Michael J., O68982.  
 DeLuca, Anthony P., O68506.  
 Demand, Erhart E., Jr., O68507.  
 Dennis, Donald A., O68508.  
 Denton, Walter M., O70180.  
 Derrick, George E., O68985.  
 de Silva, Ernest B., Jr., O68983.  
 Dewberry, Dale, O68229.  
 Dick, Harvey M., O68230.  
 Dickey, Eugene C., Jr., O68903.  
 Dickson, Lee C., O68986.  
 Dierdorff, H. Beecher, Jr., O68509.  
 Dimtsios, George J., O68510.  
 Dinges, Edward A., O68511.  
 DiSimone, Frank B., O71341.  
 Dodge, Griffin N., O68987.  
 Dolan, Robert W., O68988.  
 Dombrowski, Anthony J., O68989.  
 Donahue, James G., O68512.  
 Donnal, John A., O68990.  
 Donnell, Henry K., O73319.  
 Doran, Fred R., O71780.  
 Doty, Benjamin E., O68991.  
 Dowling, Drew, O68513.  
 Doyle, Francis J., O68514.  
 Dozier, Ollin K., O68515.  
 Dresner, Gerald E., O68516.  
 Duffy, James P., Jr., O68994.  
 Duffy, Thomas A., O68995.  
 Duisterhof, Gordon J., O68996.  
 Dukkony, Stephen J., O68997.  
 Duncan, Ross E., O68998.  
 Dunlap, Rufus T., Jr., O68999.  
 Dunn, Charles H., O72860.  
 Dunnuck, Donald W., O68517.  
 Durham, Richard L., O68518.  
 Dyer, James M., O69001.  
 Ealer, George L., O69002.  
 Earl, George L., O68817.  
 Earle, Thomas B., Jr., O69003.  
 Eastham, Frederick L., O69004.  
 Eaton, Prescott, O70089.  
 Eckhart, John W., 3d, O71487.  
 Eckles, Donald R., O68233.  
 Edward, Charles E. H., O68519.  
 Edwards, Jerry S., O73323.  
 Edwards, William H., O68909.  
 Egbert, George L., Jr., O68520.  
 Ehlers, O. Kirk, O68521.  
 Elneigl, Raymond J., O68522.  
 Elder, Robert L., Jr., O69005.  
 Elliott, Harry L., O69007.  
 Elliott, James W., O69008.  
 Ellis, Greeley H., Jr., O68523.  
 Elman, Roger P., O68524.  
 Elmore, Louis N., Jr., O69010.  
 Endler, James R., O68525.  
 Eskew, Thomas F., O69014.  
 Esser, Henry J., Jr., O69015.  
 Etheridge, James R., O70182.  
 Eubanks, James A., O68526.  
 Evans, Ira K., Jr., O72862.  
 Evans, James L., O68234.  
 Evers, John H., O69016.  
 Fargason, William H., Jr., O69919.  
 Farlow, Wilbur M., O69017.  
 Farrar, Robert G., O69018.  
 Faust, Elden Q., Jr., O68527.  
 Feilke, Glenn T., O69019.  
 Felock, Ray D., O69020.  
 Fell, Richard W., O69021.  
 Fellabaum, John N., O69022.  
 Felton, Robert G., O69023.  
 Ferguson, William P., O68343.  
 Fernandez, Robert N., O68528.  
 Ferrara, Leonard S., O69025.  
 Fewell, Oscar C., Jr., O68235.  
 Fiala, Charles J., O68529.  
 Fifer, William A., O69026.  
 Pike, Edward C., O68344.  
 Filaseta, Bart M., O68530.  
 Fischer, Richard F., O68531.  
 Fisher, Samuel H., Jr., O68532.  
 Fitch, John B., O68533.  
 Fitchett, Horace B., O69027.  
 Fitzsimmons, Eugene L., O68534.  
 Flaherty, William J., O69028.  
 Flake, Jackson L., Jr., O70136.  
 Flanagan, John S., O69029.  
 Flather, Richard W., O68535.  
 Flertzhelm, Henry A., Jr., O68536.  
 Floyd, Paul E., O68537.  
 Fluitt, John L., O69032.  
 Ford, Richard L., O69922.  
 Forrest, Ernest E., Jr., O71495.  
 Foster, Andrew J., Jr., O71789.  
 Fowler, Roy, O68538.  
 Fox, Joseph H., O68237.  
 Franklin, James D., O70091.  
 Franseen, Leonard R., O69033.  
 Frazer, Bruce W., O69034.  
 Frelmark, Gaillard A., O68539.  
 French, Rodney M., O68540.  
 Frenier, Julius A., O72872.  
 Friedersdorff, Louis C., Jr., O68541.  
 Friesen, Herbert E., O68542.  
 Froede, Carl R., O69036.  
 Fukumoto, George M., O69037.  
 Fuller, Elbert E., Jr., O68543.  
 Fuqua, Donald G., O68544.  
 Gabel, James M., O70092.  
 Gaita, Ronald J., O69038.  
 Garcia, John L., O69927.  
 Garrett, Samuel J., O69040.  
 Gassaway, Kenton C., O68931.  
 Gaumond, Robert J., O71791.  
 Geringer, Robert F., O68932.  
 Gibbons, William C., O69041.  
 Gledeman, Louis A., Jr., O69042.  
 Gil, Osvaldo L., O70093.

Gillis, John B., O69043.  
 Gilmartin, Frederick G., Jr., O68545.  
 Ginsburg, Howard D., O69044.  
 Gioiosa, Thomas E., O69045.  
 Glasgow, Robert E., O68546.  
 Glauner, Frederick W., O68547.  
 Godas, David M., O69048.  
 Godwin, William C., O69049.  
 Goetsch, Elmer A., O68241.  
 Goetz, Jerald L., O68548.  
 Gorvad, Peter L., O69051.  
 Graham, Harl G., O68549.  
 Grant, Samuel J., Jr., O68243.  
 Gray, Ralph S., O69052.  
 Greeley, Leonard J., O68550.  
 Green, Richard D., O69053.  
 Greenberg, Joseph, O69054.  
 Greenquist, James C., O68244.  
 Greer, Ralph S., O68551.  
 Gregg, John M., O69055.  
 Gregory, Clark S., Jr., O69056.  
 Greyhosky, August, O69057.  
 Greynolds, William A., O69058.  
 Griswold, Donald E., O69059.  
 Gruen, Robert W., O69060.  
 Grum, Allen F., O68552.  
 Gunnett, Robert E., O70094.  
 Haas, George A., Jr., O68553.  
 Hall, Hugh J., Jr., O68554.  
 Hall, John C., O68555.  
 Hallock, Richard G., O69062.  
 Halterman, Harry W., Jr., O68556.  
 Hamby, Dolph F., O68245.  
 Hamilla, Donald J., O68557.  
 Hammond, Carl L., O68558.  
 Hanel, Kenneth G., O69063.  
 Hardy, Alvis S., O69064.  
 Hardy, Bruce B., O68559.  
 Hare, Edward B., O68246.  
 Harrick, Stephen R., O69065.  
 Harris, James H., O68560.  
 Harris, Wesley L., O69066.  
 Harris, William H., O68561.  
 Harsant, James A., O68248.  
 Haskell, John H. F., Jr., O68562.  
 Hassebroek, DeWayne J., O69067.  
 Hawks, Thomas E., O69068.  
 Hawk, Robert C., O69069.  
 Hayes, Alva W., O69070.  
 Hayes, Jack O., O68563.  
 Hayward, Barton M., O68819.  
 Hazlett, Howard, 3d, O68564.  
 Heath, Bobby R., O72894.  
 Heiberg, Elvin R., 3d, O68565.  
 Hellig, Frank T., O69073.  
 Heitzke, Kenneth S., O68566.  
 Henderson, Walter, O68567.  
 Hendricks, Arthur D., O72896.  
 Hendricks, James Y., O69074.  
 Herman, John L., O69075.  
 Herndon, Phillip H., O69076.  
 Hickey, Ralph E., O68568.  
 Higgins, James W., O71803.  
 Higgins, Wiley T., Jr., O69078.  
 Hight, Adolph A., O69948.  
 Hilley, William W., O68569.  
 Hillsman, Dan A., O69080.  
 Hino, Peter J., O69081.  
 Hodges, Albert P., O68250.  
 Hoerning, Richard E., O69083.  
 Hoffman, Thomas, O68570.  
 Hogan, John E., O68571.  
 Hogg, James W., O68572.  
 Holcombe, Thomas W., O68573.  
 Holdcroft, George T., O69085.  
 Holden, Bobby G., O69086.  
 Holley, James P., O69087.  
 Holliday, Donald W., O69088.  
 Holman, Carson E. R., O68574.  
 Holtz, Dennis C., O69090.  
 Horner, David DuB., O68575.  
 Horton, William D., Jr., O68576.  
 Horwedel, Alan T., O68577.  
 Houk, William H., O69091.  
 Houy, Edward W., Jr., O69092.  
 Hove, James G., O68578.  
 Hovis, Warren A., Jr., O69093.  
 Howard, Newman A., Jr., O69094.  
 Howe, Roderick R., O69095.  
 Hoyle, Frank E., O72902.  
 Hoyt, Francis R., O68579.

Hrecz, Joseph, O69952.  
 Hubbard, William S., O69096.  
 Hudson, Charles F., Jr., O68363.  
 Hudson, Paul C., O69097.  
 Hughes, Bernard C., O68580.  
 Hughes, Charles M., O72492.  
 Hughes, John W., O68581.  
 Hull, Clark R., O69098.  
 Hungerford, Franklin McD., O71810.  
 Hurd, Philip S., O71525.  
 Hurlless, Bernard F., Jr., O68582.  
 Hutchenson, Dwight R., O69099.  
 Hutchinson, Cary B., Jr., O68583.  
 Hutson, Arthur C., Jr., O69100.  
 Iacobucci, Frank A., O68584.  
 Ice, Ronald E., O69101.  
 Ideman, James M., O68252.  
 Ingram, Thomas A., O69102.  
 Irons, Martin H., O69104.  
 Iverson, Harold E., O69105.  
 Jackson, Franklin R., O69107.  
 Jackson, James L., O68585.  
 Jackson, Wilfred A., O69108.  
 Jacquez, Oscar S., O70100.  
 James, Stanley L., O69109.  
 Jamieson, John F., O68586.  
 Jenes, Theodore G., Jr., O70138.  
 Jennings, Robert H., O69111.  
 Jewell, William M., Jr., O68587.  
 Johns, Jack E., O68588.  
 Johnson, Harold R., Jr., O68364.  
 Johnson, Robert H., O70102.  
 Johnson, Roland H., O69113.  
 Jolley, Alvin L., O71683.  
 Jones, Franklin R., Jr., O69116.  
 Jones, Herbert H., O69117.  
 Jones, Robert P., O69958.  
 Jones, Thomas H., Sr., O68589.  
 Jones, William D., O68590.  
 Joyce, Robert M., O68591.  
 Joyce, Thomas F., Jr., O68365.  
 Juve, Eugene H., O69119.  
 Kahl, Keith G., O68592.  
 Kallellis, James S., O69120.  
 Kallman, Michael E., O68593.  
 Kamakahi, Ronald D., O69121.  
 Kaplan, Robert L., O68594.  
 Kaufman, Louis A., O68595.  
 Kay, Joe E., O69123.  
 Kelley, Kent C., O69124.  
 Kelley, William B., O69125.  
 Kenyon, Robert B., O69126.  
 Kenzie, Ross B., O68593.  
 Ketzler, Kenneth LeR., O69127.  
 Klefer, Charles A., O69129.  
 Kimball, Douglas S., O68597.  
 Kincaid, Frank C., Jr., O68598.  
 King, William W., O70201.  
 Kinne, Milton J., Jr., O71819.  
 Kinnie, Irvin G., Jr., O68599.  
 Kitchin, Herbert A., O69131.  
 Kloeke, John G., O70139.  
 Kmlotek, George V., O69132.  
 Knoebel, Frederick W., O68257.  
 Knox, James R., O68600.  
 Koch, Ralph A., Jr., O68601.  
 Kofoed, Everett F., O69964.  
 Koontz, William E., O71538.  
 Koval, Emil D., O69134.  
 Kramer, John C., O68823.  
 Kratsch, Charles H., O69966.  
 Kretzer, Alonzo S., O69135.  
 Kuhn, Robert J., O70140.  
 Kurtz, Francis S., O69136.  
 Kvernes, Roger W., O69137.  
 LaBrash, Francis G., O68602.  
 Lacquement, Hubert W., O68603.  
 Ladd, Earl M., Jr., O68825.  
 Lafam, Robert J., O68604.  
 Lammie, James L., O68605.  
 Lampert, Bert J., Jr., O69144.  
 Land, Joe E., Jr., O68258.  
 Landry, Clifford J., O68606.  
 Lane, James C., Jr., O69146.  
 LaNoue, Carol L., O71822.  
 Larason, Charles E., O68370.  
 Larson, Richard A., O69147.  
 Larson, Walter R., O69148.  
 Laskiewicz, Henry, O69149.  
 Laucrica, Xavier A., Jr., O69150.  
 Lauer, Robert D., O69151.

Laundry, Melburn E., O68607.  
 Law, Donald C., O69152.  
 Lawrence, Herbert L., O69153.  
 Lawrence, Richard D., O68608.  
 Lawrence, William J., O70104.  
 Lawson, Larry F. O., O70205.  
 Laybourn, William E., O69154.  
 Leaf, Edwin B., Jr., O69155.  
 Leander, Richard C., O69156.  
 Lee, Lynn L., O73364.  
 Lee, Wallace A., O69157.  
 Leedy, George F., O69158.  
 Leisinger, Richard W., O69159.  
 Lenard, Stanley, O69161.  
 Leonard, Richard E., O68609.  
 Lesinski, Raymond J., O68610.  
 Leuppert, Fred W., O68262.  
 Lindgren, Gordon F., O69166.  
 Lindholm, Allen T., O68611.  
 Linka, James E., O68612.  
 Liveoak, Felix L., Jr., O68613.  
 Loedding, James A., O68614.  
 Logan, Francis S., O72921.  
 Lohrli, G. Gerald, O68615.  
 Lowman, Charles J., Jr., O68616.  
 Lowry, Montecue J., O68617.  
 Luby, Victor, O68618.  
 Luck, Leland P., O68619.  
 Lutz, Charles W., O69169.  
 Lynch, Gordon P., O72923.  
 Lynch, Homer M., O69170.  
 MacLennan, Robert G., O69187.  
 Macomber, Michael D., O68263.  
 Mactagone, Serafin G., O69188.  
 Maddux, Franklin W., O69189.  
 Maehr, Robert B., O68620.  
 Magnuson, Robert N., O69190.  
 Maher, John P., O68621.  
 Mahoney, Francis X., O70106.  
 Mallet, Henri-Gerard, O71831.  
 Malone, Dandridge M., O71832.  
 Mamoyac, Robert B., O69191.  
 Manfre, Louis E., O68622.  
 Mangels, Robert L., O68623.  
 Mann, Kenneth L., O68380.  
 Manning, James A., O69193.  
 Manning, Monroe L., O69194.  
 Manning, William J. H., Jr., O69195.  
 Maranville, Robert L., O68264.  
 Marotta, Francis X., O69977.  
 Marshall, James L., Jr., O69197.  
 Martch, Henry B., Jr., O69198.  
 Martin, Donald R., O68624.  
 Martin, Haywood H., Jr., O69199.  
 Martin, John F., O68625.  
 Martin, Robert N., O68626.  
 Massey, Joseph O., Jr., O69979.  
 Mast, Stanley I., O68266.  
 Masters, Barrie P., O72759.  
 Matson, Howard R., O68627.  
 Matthews, Charles C., Jr., O68827.  
 Mayer, Adolph E., O68628.  
 Mayhew, Charles H., 3d, O69201.  
 McBee, Michael A., O69173.  
 McBee, Willie H., O70107.  
 McCarthy, Richard J., O70108.  
 McClaren, Sherwood W., 3d, O70109.  
 McClelland, Thomas M., O71700.  
 McCluskey, James F., O68629.  
 McCormack, Robert F., 3d, O69174.  
 McCoy, Don S., O69176.  
 McDaniel, Theodore L., Jr., O68267.  
 McDonald, John R., O68630.  
 McDougal, H. A., O69177.  
 McElmoyl, Frank B., Jr., O69178.  
 McGee, Robert L., O69180.  
 McGovern, Joseph F., O68631.  
 McGraw, Russell M., O69181.  
 McGregor, Rob R., O68632.  
 McGregor, Thomas, O68633.  
 McGuffin, Robert F., O70212.  
 McGurl, Peter W., O71940.  
 McIntosh, John H., O72936.  
 McIntyre, Graham W., O68634.  
 McKay, Jack G., O69182.  
 McKenna, Thomas P., O68635.  
 McKenzie, Colin W., Jr., O72939.  
 McKenzie, Moran A., O69985.  
 McKie, Robert G., O69183.  
 McLain, James L., O69184.  
 McLennan, Stuart G., Jr., O68636.



McLeod, John S., O69185.  
 McNeese, Luna V., Jr., O68268.  
 McNutt, Donald L., O68637.  
 McReynolds, J. Carroll, O68269.  
 McSorley, Lester F., O71559.  
 Meadows, Benjamin T., O72942.  
 Meadows, Thomas R., O69202.  
 Meanor, John E., O68270.  
 Medbury, Paul R., O69203.  
 Meek, James W., O69204.  
 Meggison, Robert H., O69205.  
 Meglen, John D., O68638.  
 Meinert, Maurice E., Jr., O69206.  
 Meister, Eugene C., O69207.  
 Meloy, Guy S., 3d, O68639.  
 Menzies, Neil A., O69210.  
 Merrigan, Jack A., O68640.  
 Merritt, Allen S., O68641.  
 Merritt, Jack N., O71396.  
 Metcalfe, Robert W., O69211.  
 Metzger, Edward C., O68642.  
 Meyer, Donald L., O68643.  
 Meyer, Richard M., O69212.  
 Michel, Charles P., O69214.  
 Michener, Richard E., O69215.  
 Mihas, Leo B., O69217.  
 Mickle, Franklin O., O69218.  
 Miley, James F., O68644.  
 Miller, David H., O69219.  
 Miller, Leon M., O69220.  
 Miller, Richard A., O68645.  
 Miller, Thomas A., Jr., O70112.  
 Miotke, William A., O68646.  
 Mitchell, Alphonso, O70143.  
 Mizell, Dan J., O70214.  
 Mleko, Frank A., O68647.  
 Moffitt, John S., O69222.  
 Mollicelli, Edward V., O72626.  
 Monclova, Irving, O69223.  
 Montgomery, Robert S., 3d, O70144.  
 Moody, Theodore R., O68387.  
 Moore, Gordon E., O70145.  
 Moore, James B., O69224.  
 Moore, Jere N., Jr., O69225.  
 Moore, Patrick J., O69226.  
 Moore, Pierce M., O69227.  
 Moore, Richard E., O69228.  
 Moore, Robert L., O72420.  
 Moore, Robert O., O69229.  
 Moore, Wilbur A., Jr., O69230.  
 Moretti, Francis C., O69231.  
 Morris, George A., Jr., O69232.  
 Morris, Ralph C., O69234.  
 Morrison, Clyde L., O69235.  
 Morrison, Patton N., O68648.  
 Morsey, James A., O69236.  
 Morton, Jack E., O68649.  
 Moses, William C., O69994.  
 Mott, Carl M., Jr., O69995.  
 Motycka, David L., O68650.  
 Mullins, Robert R., O69238.  
 Mullins, Thomas E., O70441.  
 Murrell, Maxwell R., O68651.  
 Myrah, Halvor H., Jr., O68652.  
 Neal, Charles O., O68653.  
 Neilson, Clifford C., O68654.  
 Nemece, James G., O69239.  
 Nerone, Francis A., O68655.  
 Nesbitt, Hugh D., O69240.  
 Nesbitt, Thomas E., O68656.  
 Neu, Dick D., O68657.  
 Neuberger, Jack A., O68658.  
 New, Guy E., O68276.  
 Newman, Francisco B., Jr., O69241.  
 Newton, Walter H., O69242.  
 Nickell, Morton C., O69244.  
 Nicks, Jerry W., O68659.  
 Nields, Charles A., Jr., O69246.  
 Noah, Max W., O68660.  
 Noeding, John P., O68834.  
 Nolin, Edmund R., O70004.  
 Noll, Wallace W., O68661.  
 Noll, William S., O69247.  
 Nordgren, Courtland C., Jr., O68662.  
 Nugent, Thomas J., O68663.  
 Nutter, Robert H., O68664.  
 Oates, James H., O69248.  
 Oblinger, John B., Jr., O68665.  
 O'Brien, Jack E., O69249.  
 Ochs, Charles C., O69250.  
 O'Connell, Leo A., O69251.  
 O'Connor, Edward C., O72955.  
 O'Connor, Mortimer L., O68666.  
 Odiome, David W., Jr., O69252.  
 O'Donohue, John D., O72956.  
 Ogg, Robert D., O68278.  
 O'Hair, Edgar A., Jr., O68667.  
 Olmsted, James H., O69254.  
 Olsen, Lamoin A., O70006.  
 Olson, Joseph C., O68279.  
 Ondina, Jorge H., O69255.  
 O'Quinn, James J., O69256.  
 Otis, Glenn K., O68668.  
 Outland, Robert R., O69257.  
 Overstreet, Charles W., O68280.  
 Owens, Bidwell A., O68281.  
 Owens, Warren R., O69259.  
 Padilla, Manuel, O69261.  
 Panageas, Dan P., O70007.  
 Pardee, G. Winfield, O69262.  
 Park, William H., O69263.  
 Parker, Hassel L., O73385.  
 Parker, Walter E., O68669.  
 Patton, William W., Jr., O73183.  
 Paulekas, Alfred E., O68670.  
 Pauley, Francis L., O69264.  
 Payve, Albert E., Jr., O69265.  
 Pearce, Richard H., O69266.  
 Peckham, Herbert D., O68671.  
 Pehota, Edward E., O69267.  
 Perlow, Joseph P., O68672.  
 Peterson, Thorwald R., O68673.  
 Phair, John M., O69268.  
 Philbrick, Donald F., O72774.  
 Phillips, Harry LeR., Jr., O68836.  
 Phillips, John C., O68674.  
 Pies, Donald A., O70016.  
 Pigg, Jimmy L., O68675.  
 Pistenma, David A., O68676.  
 Pneuman, Frederick C., O69271.  
 Pollard, Louis M., Jr., O69273.  
 Ponder, Arno L., Jr., O71590.  
 Porter, Clair E., O72968.  
 Portteus, Willard L., Jr., O70114.  
 Potash, Charles, O69274.  
 Potter, Edwin J., O69275.  
 Pratt, Joseph B., O71952.  
 Pratt, Theodore W., O68283.  
 Price, Tommy E., O70115.  
 Prillaman, John P., O69280.  
 Prime, Charles W., O68677.  
 Proietti, Raymond A., O69281.  
 Puffer, William B., O69282.  
 Pulsifer, Donald W., O69283.  
 Pulsipher, Elwin D., O69284.  
 Pulver, Elmer W., O72972.  
 Purcell, Henry, 3d, O68678.  
 Quinn, Paul D., O69285.  
 Rainey, David M., O70116.  
 Ralls, Dan H., O70023.  
 Ramsay, Donald A., O68679.  
 Ranney, Frederick J., O71859.  
 Rathburn, Vinton L., O72779.  
 Rathjen, Arthur H., O69288.  
 Rathnau, Donald P., O70024.  
 Rawlings, Charles R., O70026.  
 Rawlinson, William E., Jr., O68680.  
 Ray, William D., O69289.  
 Rears, Joseph T., O68681.  
 Redditt, Robert H., O68396.  
 Reed, Adrian P., O68682.  
 Reed, Edwin, Jr., O68683.  
 Reinbold, John A., O69292.  
 Renner, William D., O68684.  
 Rew, Leland C., Jr., O68685.  
 Reynolds, Frederick P., 3d, O68686.  
 Rhiddlehoover, Bruce H., O69293.  
 Rhine, Hal B., O68687.  
 Rice, David K., O68688.  
 Rice, Harold E., O73389.  
 Richard, Donald W., O69294.  
 Rickard, Daniel S., O68689.  
 Riede, James R., O69295.  
 Riefler, Richard B., O69296.  
 Rieth, Kenneth L., O69297.  
 Rife, Byard W., O69298.  
 Riggs, Harold B., O72975.  
 Riley, Clemens A., O72976.  
 Riley, Frank J., O70027.  
 Riley, Otto N., Jr., O68690.  
 Riley, Walter G., Jr., O70227.  
 Rinehart, Jack L., O68287.  
 Rittgers, Forest S., Jr., O69299.  
 Ritz, James H., Jr., O70117.  
 Rivera, Roberto, O70028.  
 Roberts, Vaughn G., O69301.  
 Robinson, Edgar B., Jr., O72978.  
 Robinson, James B., Jr., O70029.  
 Roderick, Roger L., O68691.  
 Rodgers, Sterling McG., O69305.  
 Rogers, Alfred R., O69307.  
 Rogers, Elietson D., O68692.  
 Rogers, Robert F., O68693.  
 Rogers, Robert F., O70030.  
 Rollinger, Jack R., O69308.  
 Romed, Cornelius S., Jr., O69309.  
 Rose, Robert D., O68694.  
 Rosen, Leslie M., O69310.  
 Ross, James K., O69311.  
 Roy, John O., O70119.  
 Rudser, John L., O69312.  
 Rumbough, David H., O68695.  
 Rumph, Horry L., O69313.  
 Rush, Early J., 3d, O68696.  
 Rush, Robert L., O68697.  
 Russell, Cledie B., O70149.  
 Sachs, Arthur, O71864.  
 Samuelson, Dennis L., O69318.  
 Sanders, Drexel E., O71595.  
 Sanders, Ralph L., Jr., O68698.  
 Sandy, Roger D., O69319.  
 Sarbacher, Harold J., O68699.  
 Satchell, Max E., O68700.  
 Satterfield, James R., O68288.  
 Schaenzer, John E., O68539.  
 Schlom, John S., O70033.  
 Schmidt, Donald R., O69701.  
 Schmidt, Herbert R., O68702.  
 Schmidt, Theodore H., O69321.  
 Schmidt, Walter H., Jr., O68703.  
 Schnarr, Charles A., O72984.  
 Schoening, George W., O71718.  
 Schoonover, Jack E., O69322.  
 Schotanus, Merle W., O69323.  
 Schriever, Byron N., O68291.  
 Schroeder, Robert L., O68704.  
 Schuver, Rudy P., O68289.  
 Schwalje, Donald D., O69327.  
 Schwartz, Jules J., O69325.  
 Schweitzer, Glenn E., O68705.  
 Scoblick, John J. P., Jr., O68706.  
 Scofield, Robert E., O68707.  
 Scott, Frank T., O70121.  
 Scoville, Roger C., O69328.  
 Searls, Billie E., O69329.  
 Seegmueller, Gene A., O68708.  
 Segal, Robert, O68709.  
 Seigle, John W., O68710.  
 Selavka, Carl, O69330.  
 Semerjian, Sarkis, O68711.  
 Senich, Donald, O69331.  
 Serven, Harold M., Jr., O70035.  
 Seto, Sam C., Jr., O69332.  
 Shaw, Donald E., O68712.  
 Shaw, Joseph N., O69334.  
 Sheard, Joe H., O68713.  
 Shedden, Eckols L., O70036.  
 Sherman, William G., O71869.  
 Sholar, Michael B., O69335.  
 Shortridge, Douglass R., O69336.  
 Sibley, James S., O68714.  
 Siebert, Frederick J., O68715.  
 Sievers, Ralph H., Jr., O69337.  
 Sifford, William F., Jr., O68716.  
 Simko, Andrew M., O68717.  
 Simmons, Marvin E., O69338.  
 Simons, Frank D., O69339.  
 Simpson, Claude S., Jr., O69340.  
 Singleton, Russell K., Jr., O69341.  
 Skidmore, Lowell H., O68718.  
 Slater, James J., O69342.  
 Slusar, Peter, O69344.  
 Smartt, Richard W., O69347.  
 Smith, Bailey B., 3d, O68293.  
 Smith, Bill J., O70039.  
 Smith, Clyde C., Jr., O69348.  
 Smith, David C., O68719.  
 Smith, Donald E., O68294.  
 Smith, Donald H., O69349.  
 Smith, Donald L., O69350.  
 Smith, Edgar H., Jr., O68720.  
 Smith, Fred L., O68721.  
 Smith, James D., O68295.

Smith, Julian H., O69351.  
 Smith, Loyce N., O69352.  
 Smith, Perry A., O70042.  
 Smith, Raymond C., O69353.  
 Smith, Robert LaF., O68722.  
 Smith, Rodney H., O68723.  
 Smith, Vernard J., O68296.  
 Smith, William F., O71963.  
 Smythe, John D., O68724.  
 Snead, William K., O68725.  
 Snyder, Francis, O68726.  
 Soja, Eugene R., O68727.  
 Solomon, Robert B., O72990.  
 Sorenson, Darwin H., O68297.  
 Sorrels, Charles V., O70122.  
 Soukup, John P., O69354.  
 Spears, Gilbert, Jr., O69355.  
 Spelr, Montgomery T., O68728.  
 Spotts, Rodney W., O69357.  
 Stallings, Joseph L., O69358.  
 Stanberry, Billy M., O71876.  
 Stanford, Thomas L., Jr., O68405.  
 Stanley, George F., O68298.  
 Starke, John B., O69359.  
 Stein, Henry J., Jr., O69360.  
 Stelter, James A., O69362.  
 Stenbridge, William A., O69363.  
 Stepanek, Walter F., O68729.  
 Stern, Jack M., O71607.  
 Sterzik, Wilfred L., O69364.  
 Stevens, Richard W., O68844.  
 Stevenson, Leroy P., O69366.  
 Stewart, David T., O72992.  
 Stewart, John R., O69367.  
 Stewart, Karl R., O68730.  
 Stieffel, Ray H., Jr., O73410.  
 Stinson, William C., Jr., O68731.  
 Stone, Hardy R., 3d, O69368.  
 Stoneburner, John F., O68732.  
 Stotser, Don M., O69370.  
 Stoudemire, Harry B., O69371.  
 Stoutamire, David F., Jr., O68300.  
 Stretcher, Baxter R., O70152.  
 Stuart, James R., Jr., O68733.  
 Sullivan, Roland R., O68734.  
 Sullivan, Roy L., 2d, O68735.  
 Suplizio, Paul E., O68736.  
 Sutton, Thomas R., O68407.  
 Sutton, William J., 3d, O68737.  
 Swain, Carroll E., O68302.  
 Swank, David, O69374.  
 Swanson, Carl O., Jr., O68303.  
 Swanson, James R., O69375.  
 Sweeney, Kenneth J., O68738.  
 Sydnor, Elliott P., Jr., O72656.  
 Takahashi, Lawrence M., O69376.  
 Talley, Clarence E., Jr., O68739.  
 Talley, John D., Jr., O70050.  
 Tant, Benjamin E., Jr., O68740.  
 Tanzer, John B., O68741.  
 Tapley, Curtis T., O69377.  
 Tate, Penfield W., 2d, O69378.  
 Taylor, Cedric DeV., O69379.  
 Taylor, Thomas T., O69380.  
 Tchon, Richard J., O68742.  
 Teller, Floyd E., O69381.  
 Temp, John R., O68743.  
 Terry, Robert S., O69382.  
 Thomas, Donald R., O69383.  
 Thomas, Hiram J., O68304.  
 Thomas, Robert J., O68744.  
 Thomas, Samuel M., Jr., O68745.  
 Thompson, Fred K., O68746.  
 Thompson, Harry L., O68305.  
 Thompson, Horace E., O69384.  
 Thompson, Howard B., O68747.  
 Thompson, Kenneth R., O69385.  
 Thompson, Richard W., O71733.  
 Thompson, William J., O69386.  
 Thurman, Maxwell R., O70125.  
 Tighe, Charles J., O68748.  
 Tilley, Victor M., O69387.  
 Tolbert, James R., O69388.  
 Toman, John, O68749.  
 Tomlinsong, Paul D., O68750.  
 Tompkins, Hiram K., O68751.  
 Touchstone, Stanford M., O68752.  
 Tower, John B., O71615.  
 Tuck, William A., O69389.  
 Tullar, Thomas A., O69390.  
 Tullos, Kenneth W., O68307.

Tumperl, John R. E., O68753.  
 Turner, James McV., Jr., O70240.  
 Tutek, Henry G., O70053.  
 van den Berg, Egerton K., O68754.  
 Vander Meer, Richard G., O68755.  
 Van Deusen, Frederick F., O68756.  
 Vawter, Raymond M., O68308.  
 Ventrella, Rocco F., Jr., O68757.  
 Vernon, Graham D., O68758.  
 Vet, Maarten, O68759.  
 Viereck, Ennis A., Jr., O68760.  
 Vilas, John R., O69394.  
 Volker, Gilbert A., O68761.  
 Volpe, Joseph J., O68762.  
 Vose, Paul C., O68763.  
 Wade, James P., Jr., O68764.  
 Waldrop, Max L., O69397.  
 Walker, Daniel E., O68765.  
 Walker, James H., O69398.  
 Walker, James T., Jr., O68309.  
 Walker, William E., O68766.  
 Wallace, Festus E., O71887.  
 Wallingford, Ralph E., O70060.  
 Walls, Glenn E., O68409.  
 Walsh, Eugene R., O69399.  
 Walters, Monty W., O68767.  
 Ward, Edward W., O73004.  
 Wardlaw, Worth L., Jr., O68768.  
 Warner, Paul B., O73058.  
 Warren, James R., O71890.  
 Wasiewski, Richard F., O69403.  
 Waters, Douglas G., O68769.  
 Waters, George D., O68770.  
 Watkins, William W., Jr., O73422.  
 Watson, James M., O69405.  
 Watson, Woody B., O69406.  
 Watts, Allen H., Jr., O70241.  
 Weall, Robert H., O69408.  
 Wearn, Robert M., Jr., O69409.  
 Weatherly, Norman F., O70061.  
 Webb, Jimmy R., O69410.  
 Weidenthal, Carlton P., O69412.  
 Wehmiller, William W., O68771.  
 Wells, Arthur D., O68772.  
 Wells, David T., O68773.  
 Wells, William T., O69413.  
 Welsh, Robert W., O69414.  
 West, Charles R., O68417.  
 Westbrook, Thomas J., O69415.  
 Wettlauffer, Andrew C., O69416.  
 Whalen, Dennis D., O68774.  
 Whann, John T., O69417.  
 Whitaker, Malvern R., O71299.  
 White, Robert N., Jr., O68775.  
 Whitesel, Thomas K., Jr., O69421.  
 Whittington, Richard H., O69422.  
 Whittington, Wesley E., O69423.  
 Wieland, Kay L., O69424.  
 Wiegla, Stanley V., Jr., O68776.  
 Wilcox, Robert L., Jr., O70066.  
 Wilkins, Eugene E., O69425.  
 Wilkins, Julian A., O69426.  
 Williams, Franklin A., O69427.  
 Williams, George F., O68777.  
 Williams, Grady W., O68848.  
 Williams, Howard M., O70158.  
 Williams, John H., O70242.  
 Williams, Ronald E., O68314.  
 Williams, Thomas E., O68778.  
 Williamson, Richard E., O69428.  
 Williamson, William E., O69429.  
 Willis, Richard S., O69430.  
 Willis, John T., O69431.  
 Wilson, Alvin T., Jr., O69432.  
 Wilson, Charles C., Jr., O69433.  
 Wilson, Dennis F., O69434.  
 Wilson, Donald P., O68779.  
 Wilson, Dwight L., O70067.  
 Wilson, Francis V., O69435.  
 Wilson, Gene F., O71748.  
 Wilson, Gerald F., O69436.  
 Wilson, Jack D., O68780.  
 Wilson, Joel F., O69437.  
 Wilson, Joseph C., O68781.  
 Wilson, Robert E., O71307.  
 Winegar, Lucien T., O72666.  
 Wise, John E., O68782.  
 Wolfe, Oren, O70069.  
 Wollenberg, William F., O69439.  
 Worthy, Clifford, Jr., O68783.  
 Wright, Robert W., O69442.

Wubbena, William L., Jr., O68784.  
 Yetter, Greyson T., O68317.  
 Yoder, Charles D., O68318.  
 Young, Clyde A., Jr., O70070.  
 Young, George D., O73433.  
 Young, John H., Jr., O68785.  
 Young, John W., O69443.  
 Young, Richard A., O68786.  
 Young, Roy J., O70129.  
 Youngker, Joe L., O68320.  
 Yuengel, William W., O68787.  
 Yunker, Sylvester J., O71900.  
 Zargan, Robert T., O68788.  
 Zemsch, Robert J., O69446.  
 Zimmer, Leon S., O68789.  
 Zimmerman, William K., O70073.  
 Zipp, Charles W., O69447.  
 Zoekler, William R., O73015.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Austin, Lloyd K., O69852.  
 Bomberger, Robert W., Jr., O71904.  
 Brandt, Clarke M., O70132.  
 Bullock, Howard R., O73023.  
 Campbell, William J., O73089.  
 Fowler, Harland W., Jr., O73031.  
 Ginsberg, David M., O71922.  
 Heath, Jack F., O73036.  
 Hoggan, Malcolm D., O73037.  
 Johnson, Wirt, VanM., O73040.  
 Kellel, Frank, Jr., O72393.  
 Mateer, Charles A., O69200.  
 Mhyre, Noel L., O69213.  
 Riggs, Albert C., Jr., O71956.  
 Rigney, Max E., O71957.  
 Roche, Donald C., O69304.  
 Rodriguez, James G., O69306.  
 Rusiewicz, Lawrence L., O69316.  
 Schwartz, Charles R., O69324.  
 Thomas, Tommy, O70051.  
 Walker, James F., O70058.  
 Yoran, Darwin E., O68319.

*To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps*

DeLozier, Dorothy M., L455.  
 Fisher, Audrey A., L470.  
 McCarney, Alice M., L484.  
 Mykleby, Phyllis R., L471.  
 Oliver, Willemmae M., L479.  
 Russell, Marilyn J., L461.  
 Schmerling, Doris M., L473.  
 Smith, Ann B., L474.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps*

Dyson, Barbara J., N2597.  
 Evans, Mary L., N2639.  
 Gipson, Marguerite L., N2596.  
 Henschen, Retha M., N2683.  
 LeBlanc, Eunice M., N2593.  
 Light, Lucile M., N2667.  
 Lothian, Elizabeth E., N2594.  
 May, Eleanor G., N2599.  
 McCarthy, Rosemary T., N2622.  
 Osborne, Rose M., N2684.  
 Paradis, Madeleine V., N2600.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Accountius, Patricia L., R10158.  
 Anthony, Frances J., R10160.  
 Damsbo, Ann M., M10158.  
 Estrada, Betty A., R10159.  
 Galt, Elizabeth A., M10149.  
 Gregory, Rita T., M10162.  
 McVay, Mary R., J79.  
 O'Brien, Elizabeth A., J80.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Abcoosh, Norman D., O32171.  
 Ackert, Thomas W., O32005.



- Adams, William L., Jr., O43651.  
 Albert, George E., O32279.  
 Albert, Jack F., O32097.  
 Albert, Joseph L., O40344.  
 Allen, Arthur W., Jr., O22034.  
 Allen, Ben E., O32103.  
 Allen, Raymond W., Jr., O21810.  
 Alley, John A., Jr., O52203.  
 Allwine, Franklin N., O43661.  
 Ambron, Tyrus R., O32215.  
 Anderson, Leland E., O52216.  
 Angster, Robert C., O32124.  
 Archer, Norman R., O38968.  
 Armstrong, Edward B., O32267.  
 Arnold, Bryan C., O20801.  
 Arnold, Thomas St. J., O32040.  
 Arthur, Frank M., O32290.  
 Attaway, Elmer J., O40321.  
 Auerbach, Alvin B., O20547.  
 Austin, Wallace, O32191.  
 Ax, Clarence F., O32198.  
 Ayres, Laurence T., Jr., O43715.  
 Bachelor, Donald M., O43723.  
 Bailey, Harle G., Jr., O32167.  
 Ball, Arthur C., O32070.  
 Bane, John C., O21897.  
 Barber, Homer G., O22130.  
 Barkman, William E., O38899.  
 Barnett, William H., O22104.  
 Barrell, Richard, O32104.  
 Bartholet, John C., O43845.  
 Bartow, Charles P., O52310.  
 Bary, Robert S., O32296.  
 Bauer, Elmer H., O43502.  
 Baumgartner, John W., O43642.  
 Beardsley, Ford M., O40311.  
 Bearss, Ernest H., O32020.  
 Beattie, Fountain F., Jr., O52265.  
 Beckedorff, Lawrence LeR., O21781.  
 Beere, Donald C., O21893.  
 Beeson, John J., 3d, O32013.  
 Belon, Ralph G., O43746.  
 Benjamin, Roy F., O32062.  
 Beplat, James A., O43694.  
 Bieri, George A., O40298.  
 Billups, James S., Jr., O21932.  
 Bird, Robert J., O32343.  
 Black, Daniel N., O52309.  
 Black, George W., O32192.  
 Blair, John H., 3d, O44388.  
 Blocker, Jack S., O32118.  
 Blue, Daniel L., O31997.  
 Bogardus, Allan L., O43853.  
 Bogart, Frank A., O40325.  
 Boles, John K., Jr., O22025.  
 Booth, Cornell D., O52271.  
 Boswell, Charles B., O38976.  
 Bowers, William S., O38973.  
 Bowie, Richard T., O21921.  
 Bowman, Harold M., Jr., O43601.  
 Boy, Pierre D., O32297.  
 Boye, Frederic W., Jr., O21891.  
 Boyer, Jack W., O32145.  
 Boylan, Vincent L., O22162.  
 Boyle, Joseph E., O40188.  
 Boyle, William J., O21953.  
 Boyles, Samuel J., O32168.  
 Bradley, William T., O21768.  
 Brady, Stuart F., O32329.  
 Brannon, John M., O32156.  
 Briggs, Merritt W., O38964.  
 Brinker, Walter E., O21776.  
 Brinkerhoff, William A., O43708.  
 Bristol, Matt C. C., Jr., O22027.  
 Brockman, Ernest F., O22147.  
 Brown, John P., O43653.  
 Brown, Paul J., O38959.  
 Brown, Richard K., O32333.  
 Brown, Shannon D., O52247.  
 Brownfield, Albert R., O21905.  
 Bruehl, Paul E., O32270.  
 Brunl, Albert V., O32195.  
 Bruns, Stockton D., O32292.  
 Buechner, Carl A., Jr., O22155.  
 Burk, Walter J., O32043.  
 Burnett, Darrell H., O32177.  
 Burr, Wesley H., O32019.  
 Bush, Sterling C., O43914.  
 Butts, Robert E., O32286.  
 Byrd, William H., Jr., O52267.  
 Byrne, John D., O21837.  
 Calvert, Charles W., O52232.  
 Camp, Robert H., O21798.  
 Campbell, Charles H., O32031.  
 Campbell, Charles S., O43615.  
 Campbell, Charles T., O32180.  
 Campbell, John, Jr., O43649.  
 Canon, Jack Y., O43830.  
 Cantrell, James L., O21758.  
 Capers, Thomas S., Jr., O32004.  
 Carlisle, Gerald, O40324.  
 Carnes, Hughes A., O43674.  
 Carter, George W., Jr., O32349.  
 Carter, Sam, O38955.  
 Carvey, James B., O22095.  
 Case, Charles C., Jr., O43824.  
 Casey, Charles W., O32356.  
 Cassidy, Robert F., O21783.  
 Casto, Carl S., O32007.  
 Caulder, Bruce B., O43626.  
 Cella, Andrew, O52269.  
 Chamblin, Francis A., O32255.  
 Chapla, Benjamin C., O22170.  
 Chapman, Oren D., O43828.  
 Chapman, Warren C., O21939.  
 Cheek, Andrew R., O32306.  
 Christianson, Charles V., O43913.  
 Clark, James P., O40342.  
 Clark, Sam J., O40064.  
 Claypool, Charles B., O43693.  
 Cleverly, Richard deF., O21862.  
 Clifford, Paul T., O22135.  
 Clough, Casper, Jr., O21979.  
 Clowes, George C., O32367.  
 Coates, Charles E., Jr., O21746.  
 Cochran, James M., O21945.  
 Coffey, Joseph L., O21904.  
 Cole, George R., O20842.  
 Coleman, Robert M., O22008.  
 Colley, Martin H., O38982.  
 Collins, James L., Jr., O21788.  
 Collins, Kenneth W., O22169.  
 Commerford, Leon, Jr., O40293.  
 Compton, Thomas C., O20692.  
 Cone, Sidney L., O40362.  
 Conley, Charles D., O52260.  
 Conner, Hackett L., Jr., O21855.  
 Convery, William J., O52244.  
 Cook, James S., Jr., O43655.  
 Cookson, George M., O32021.  
 Cooperider, Howard V., O22035.  
 Corgan, Francis H., O42885.  
 Cosgrove, Sherman D., O38990.  
 Cowan, Kay K., O52217.  
 Coyne, Christopher C., O21879.  
 Cramer, Frederic M., O52273.  
 Crandall, Riel S., O21767.  
 Crawford, Alfred H., Jr., O32229.  
 Crawford, Harold M., O21840.  
 Crawford, Thomas M., O21983.  
 Croft, Lucian C., O32189.  
 Cromwell, Samuel M., O32176.  
 Crouch, Robert L., Jr., O43777.  
 Crowell, Albert W., O52319.  
 Currier, Don O., O40318.  
 Dameron, Ernest C., O32376.  
 Daniel, Roy E., Jr., O38954.  
 Dannemiller, Edward McC., O21822.  
 Daugherty, Francis, O52222.  
 Davidson, Henry E., Jr., O32295.  
 Davidson, Michael S., O22051.  
 Davidson, Phillip B., Jr., O21969.  
 Davis, John N., O22070.  
 Davis, Thomas W., 3d, O22059.  
 Davis, Walter W., O20878.  
 Davitt, James H., O43490.  
 Dawley, Jay P., O21750.  
 D'Elosua, Ramon F., O43713.  
 Deshon, George E., O21362.  
 Dickerson, John O., O22071.  
 Dietz, Carroll W., O21836.  
 Dillard, David S., O22175.  
 Dix, Jewett A., O32049.  
 Dixon, Jobie J., O31744.  
 Dobson, John W., O21851.  
 Dodge, Roy T., O21468.  
 Doering, Sam F., O53058.  
 Dolle, Walter C., O21813.  
 Dolvin, Welborn G., O21980.  
 Donald, Herbert P., O52223.  
 Donaldson, John H., Jr., O32721.  
 Donlon, James D., Jr., O32039.  
 Dooley, Thomas, O32159.  
 Dowd, Maxim J., O32210.  
 Drake, Leland R., O43894.  
 Drake, William D., O32158.  
 Drazen, Leonard, O40336.  
 Drouillard, Eugene G., O32125.  
 Dudley, Edward F., O40374.  
 Dueker, Fred E., O32051.  
 Duke, Charles M., O21753.  
 Dunlap, Nicholas, O32094.  
 Durgin, Chesley F., O32363.  
 Dziuban, Stanley W., O21738.  
 Eckland, Kenneth E., O32334.  
 Eckstein, Paul A., O40331.  
 Edgerton, Eric R., O43850.  
 Edwards, Edward G., O32048.  
 Edwards, Irwin A., O32149.  
 Ehrhardt, Clarence P., O43644.  
 Etka, Dale L., O43898.  
 Evans, Belmont S., Jr., O21811.  
 Evans, John T., O32142.  
 Ewell, Julian J., O21791.  
 Fair, Felder L., O31984.  
 Fargo, Lynn D., O32242.  
 Farrell, Norman, O21759.  
 Farris, Stephen C., O22022.  
 Feliz, James E., O43752.  
 Fishkin, Leon J., O52215.  
 Fives, Paul E., O32170.  
 Flint, Charles W., O43656.  
 Florance, Charles W., Jr., O22119.  
 Flynn, Stanley F., O43765.  
 Forrest, Frank G., O22101.  
 Fox, Elmer W., Jr., O52318.  
 Francis, Harrison S., O52233.  
 Fredericks, Charles G., O22092.  
 Frederickson, Erwin C., O32347.  
 Fromer, Paul S., O32141.  
 Fry, Clayton T., O43904.  
 Fuller, Carl W., O31689.  
 Funchess, Linwood E., O20875.  
 Gallagher, Edward J., O21775.  
 Galt, Edward A., O43743.  
 Garvey, Dale M., O43910.  
 Geary, Edward M., O21887.  
 George, Robert D., O43815.  
 George, William C., O21913.  
 Gerber, Fred E., O32023.  
 Gerety, John S., O43605.  
 Gibbons, Ulrich G., O21874.  
 Gibbs, Charles H., O43764.  
 Gierlak, Michael P., O40363.  
 Gilbert, Vernon G., O21850.  
 Gilchrist, Malcolm F., Jr., O22077.  
 Giles, Tommy H., Jr., O52120.  
 Gillespie, John J., O32143.  
 Glade, Kenneth, O21181.  
 Glenn, Ned W., O22107.  
 Gnau, William D., O43828.  
 Goetz, John B. M., O43696.  
 Golden, Barney, O40337.  
 Goodpaster, Andrew J., Jr., O21739.  
 Goodwin, David B., O21914.  
 Gorski, Andrew G., O31993.  
 Grace, William Van N., O40365.  
 Graff, Laverne W., O52239.  
 Graham, Robert O., Jr., O32064.  
 Graham, Thomas A., Jr., O32231.  
 Grant, Walter H., O22093.  
 Gray, Millard G., O32137.  
 Green, James D., O22182.  
 Greening, Orlando L., O43906.  
 Greer, Harry A., O43685.  
 Gregg, Francis H., O32037.  
 Guenther, Edgar T., O32206.  
 Guerdrum, Thorvald J., O43829.  
 Haberer, Walter J., Jr., O52278.  
 Haberstroh, Herbert L., O52210.  
 Hackett, Charles J., O21954.  
 Haffa, Robert P., O21809.  
 Hale, William H., O22184.  
 Hall, DeWitt N., O22083.  
 Hanchin, Ralph J., O21895.  
 Hand, Robert D., O32294.  
 Hanks, Joseph E., O43866.  
 Hanson, Ellwood F., O52281.  
 Harding, Stanley L., O32134.  
 Haskins, George D., O32110.  
 Hassett, Burrell C., O38987.  
 Hatchell, Henry C., O32200.  
 Hawksworth, Frederick W., O43619.

- Hayes, John J., O32309.  
 Haynes, Charley W., O43719.  
 Heaton, Curtis E., O32275.  
 Heiser, Joseph M., Jr., O43773.  
 Hennessey, James T., O32274.  
 Henry, William J., O21928.  
 Hickman, Mahlon D., O32355.  
 Hicks, Paul S., O32028.  
 Higgins, Walter M., Jr., O21987.  
 Hill, Robert J., Jr., O21933.  
 Hillis, William T., O40369.  
 Hinternhoff, William A., O21844.  
 Hixson, Nathan H., O52254.  
 Hoard, Maurice A., Jr., O43729.  
 Hodges, Carroll B., O43751.  
 Hogan, Julian L., O32178.  
 Hollerbach, Eugene J., O32076.  
 Hollis, Charles H., O38981.  
 Holmes, William W., O32247.  
 Holt, Arthur E., O32326.  
 Holt, Frank T., O21908.  
 Holtz, Werner, O32309.  
 Hooker, Howard C., O43717.  
 Hoppenstein, Isaac, O32373.  
 Hoskins, Harry D., Jr., O43846.  
 Houlson, Keith H., O52229.  
 Houser, Harold H., O32050.  
 Hudgins, Seth F., O21947.  
 Huff, Hotenel J., O43868.  
 Hughes, William McC., O32322.  
 Hull, Donald F., O22067.  
 Hull, Keith M., O21885.  
 Huppert, George H., Jr., O32277.  
 Hustead, Charles L., Jr., O43711.  
 Huston, Fred R., O43812.  
 Hutson, Richard K., O32212.  
 Innes, William H., O43867.  
 Jackson, John H., O52204.  
 Jackson, Robert J., Jr., O38986.  
 Jacobs, Stanley E., O52256.  
 Jameson, Roy A., O32072.  
 Janowski, Raymond A., O21869.  
 Jarrold, Milton, O43699.  
 Jefferts, Jerome S., O52283.  
 Jeffrey, Paul R., O40358.  
 Jenkins, Park T., O32218.  
 Johnson, James E., O43704.  
 Johnson, James M., O52276.  
 Johnson, John G., O21929.  
 Johnson, John P., O43677.  
 Johnson, Sterling R., O21873.  
 Johnson, Warren R., O43697.  
 Jones, David W., Jr., O43631.  
 Jones, Gordon C., O32320.  
 Jordan, Ralph E., O21911.  
 Judson, William J., O31769.  
 Juskalian, George, O32371.  
 Kall, Samuel G., O22072.  
 Katin, Joseph G., O43758.  
 Keefe, James H., O43634.  
 Keller, James H., O21871.  
 Kellett, Donald T., O40323.  
 Kellner, Fred W., O32358.  
 Kelly, Harold L., Jr., O52292.  
 Kelly, John J., O22185.  
 Kennedy, Justus C., O43856.  
 Kerwin, Walter T., Jr., O21963.  
 Ketcham, Edward P., Jr., O38963.  
 Kiely, John J., Jr., O32069.  
 Kingman, Dan C., O32045.  
 Kinnard, Harry W. O., Jr., O21990.  
 Kinney, Oliver G., O32067.  
 Kirby, Lee M., O22048.  
 Kirby-Smith, Edmund, O21745.  
 Klein, Phillip I., O32113.  
 Kling, Carl V., O40366.  
 Knight, Darce R., O43887.  
 Koch, Otto R., Jr., O32074.  
 Koerner, Rudolph C., O52211.  
 Kooker, Willis E., O43658.  
 Koreman, Edward H., O38953.  
 Kostanski, Henry S., O43755.  
 Kouns, Charles W., O22129.  
 Kreighbaum, Eugene C., O43883.  
 Krisman, Michael J., O21880.  
 Kronke, Charles J., Jr., O40371.  
 Kulp, John C., Jr., O43768.  
 Kunzig, Louis A., Jr., O21741.  
 Kurth, Edward H., O21807.  
 Kurtz, Josiah S., O22171.  
 Lain, Dalton W., O40302.  
 Lake, Gerald A., O43901.  
 La Mee, William S., 3d, O32364.  
 Lampert, Lester L., Jr., O22100.  
 Lane, Barton G., Jr., O21876.  
 Lane, Douglas H., O40388.  
 Larsen, Stanley R., O22094.  
 Lasché, Ernest P., O22073.  
 Lavell, Robert G., O32080.  
 Lavole, Leon F., O32127.  
 Law, William, O32169.  
 Lawrance, Jackson S., Jr., O32003.  
 Lawrence, Charles E., O52261.  
 Leckie, William E., O40296.  
 Lee, Levin L., O22172.  
 Leighton, Ralph E., O43688.  
 Lennhoff, Charles D. T., O21882.  
 Lentz, Carl, 2d, O21993.  
 Lerette, Earle L., O22133.  
 Lerner, Gerald P., O32199.  
 Lesneski, Stanley V., O32053.  
 Levin, Edward, O51910.  
 Levine, Lester H., O32155.  
 Liakos, Elias F., O32238.  
 Lilly, Roger M., O21924.  
 Linvill, Robert R., O40305.  
 Livermore, Francis S., O32203.  
 Liuy, Jorge J., O56898.  
 Long, Floyd K., O43778.  
 Long, Herbert S., Jr., O31985.  
 Looney, Jack R., O22164.  
 Lyke, James P., O43731.  
 Lyle, Clayton B., Jr., O40306.  
 Lyle, James B., O32348.  
 MacDonald, John E., O52208.  
 Macken, John J., O40304.  
 Mancuso, Stephen J., O22006.  
 Marlin, Raymond B., O21899.  
 Marsden, Henry H., Jr., O43643.  
 Marshall, David N., O52221.  
 Martens, Howard W., O32324.  
 Martin, Lawrence A., O43665.  
 Martin, Sidney T., O21772.  
 Martin, Talbert I., O43893.  
 Maslowski, Ladislaus C., O21789.  
 Matheson, Davis M., O21757.  
 Matter, Robert A., O22132.  
 Maxwell, John B., 2d, O21942.  
 McCaffrey, William J., O22065.  
 McChristian, Joseph A., O21966.  
 McClellan, Harry W., O22173.  
 McClure, Myron, O32241.  
 McCollam, Albert E., O21748.  
 McConnell, Edward T., O21996.  
 McConnell, William J., O22052.  
 McCool, Edward J., O32024.  
 McCrorey, James L., Jr., O22158.  
 McCutchen, George, O40341.  
 McCutchen, Wilnot R., O21744.  
 McElroy, Virgil M., O43269.  
 McFerren, Carl D., O21923.  
 McKenzie, Walter B., O32264.  
 McMahon, Robert E., O22137.  
 McMillin, Dan S., O32010.  
 McWilliams, John K., O32257.  
 Medinnis, Charles L. P., O22023.  
 Medusky, John W., O21756.  
 Megica, Martin G., O21881.  
 Meyer, John H., O22179.  
 Mial, John P., O22157.  
 Michaels, Charles E., O38972.  
 Milburn, William R., O31599.  
 Mildren, Frank T., O21992.  
 Miller, Clifford L., 2d, O22149.  
 Miller, Donald B., O22018.  
 Minahan, Daniel J., Jr., O21799.  
 Mist, Ellis H., O52255.  
 Mitchell, Arlo W., O43772.  
 Mitchell, John E., Jr., O52328.  
 Mitchell, Leonard D., O31625.  
 Mize, Paul H., O32335.  
 Montgomery, Brian O., O32529.  
 Moore, Robert E., O32244.  
 Mosheim, Emil L., O32272.  
 Motter, John C., O32288.  
 Mouchet, William D., O43802.  
 Mounsey, Glen A., O31607.  
 Mount, Charles McN., Jr., O21849.  
 Moushegian, Richard, O22109.  
 Muir, James I., Jr., O21802.  
 Mulcahy, Patrick D., O22015.  
 Mullen, John M., O43896.  
 Mullinix, Joseph B., O32086.  
 Munro, Perry A., O32090.  
 Murch, Gordon E., O31651.  
 Murphy, William D., O20944.  
 Murr, Arnold P., O43720.  
 Murray, Harry L., Jr., O22140.  
 Murray, Robert M., O52094.  
 Myers, Harry McN., O21835.  
 Myers, William M., O32160.  
 Nanney, David Y., O21866.  
 Napier, Jack P., O43657.  
 Naudts, Morris J., O32265.  
 Nelson, Lloyd S., O52325.  
 Nelson, William H., Jr., O31992.  
 Nestlerode, Howard E., Jr., O32282.  
 Newcomb, Fidelis D., O22056.  
 Newcomer, Francis K., Jr., O21898.  
 Nicolls, Robert S., O32317.  
 Nolan, Daniel A., Jr., O21988.  
 Noland, Marion B., O43603.  
 Norling, Ralph L., O32112.  
 Norris, Jack K., O21865.  
 Oakley, Samuel H., O43841.  
 Oberst, Donald A., O31451.  
 O'Brien, Francis W., O32196.  
 Odum, Herbert R., O22086.  
 O'Farrell, Hugh R., O43888.  
 O'Hara, Lewis B., O31887.  
 Olson, John E., O22125.  
 Olson, Roy I., O52117.  
 Osborne, Robert J. C., O43819.  
 Osborne, William L., O32154.  
 Ostrom, Herbert N., O43614.  
 Outlaw, Fredrick B., O32089.  
 Owen, Henry M., Jr., O32083.  
 Owens, Owen W., O38958.  
 Pachomski, John, O40252.  
 Paden, Bill W., O52291.  
 Page, Robert W., Jr., O22120.  
 Palik, Ted J., O43611.  
 Palsrok, John, O43722.  
 Papa, Anthony E., O52294.  
 Paraska, Nicholas, O21765.  
 Pardue, Norman C., O40354.  
 Parker, Howard C., O32108.  
 Parsons, Charles J., Jr., O22183.  
 Patterson, William G., O32278.  
 Patterson, William H., O22110.  
 Paul, Thurston T., Jr., O32243.  
 Pavick, John J., O21780.  
 Payne, Leslie M., O43797.  
 Peacock, Earl G., O43873.  
 Pence, James L., O43875.  
 Pennell, Robert, O22139.  
 Perry, Edwin A., O32030.  
 Perry, Fred E., O38974.  
 Pershall, William R., O43825.  
 Pertl, Martin C., O40349.  
 Peters, Clifton A., O32202.  
 Peterson, Kenneth J., O31794.  
 Pfanz, Louis W., Jr., O43600.  
 Phillips, Royal E., O32136.  
 Pickett, George E., O21938.  
 Pierre, George H., Jr., O32258.  
 Pille, Roy F., O52311.  
 Ploger, Robert R., O21760.  
 Poinier, Arthur D., O21999.  
 Preston, William M., O22099.  
 Price, David B., O43842.  
 Price, William H., Jr., O21903.  
 Pridgen, Claude L., O38965.  
 Queenin, Hugh F., O40367.  
 Rager, Edward E., O22116.  
 Rankin, Alexander J., O32166.  
 Rankin, John A., O32140.  
 Ray, John, O21821.  
 Reagan, Bruce W., O38975.  
 Redman, Charles L., Jr., O32311.  
 Reed, Arthur W., O21878.  
 Reese, Arthur W., O43818.  
 Reeves, Joseph R., O21820.  
 Register, William F., Jr., O43757.  
 Reilly, William R., O22163.  
 Reynolds, Maurice J., O43793.  
 Reynolds, Norman G., O32099.  
 Rice, John A., O43635.  
 Richardson, James D., O21761.  
 Richmond, Jack B., O43519.  
 Riggs, Dan E., O52285.  
 Rippert, Jacob K., O22115.  
 Roberts, James F., O21920.  
 Robideaux, Robert J., O32066.



Robinet, Albert L., O21892.  
 Roder, Charles C., O43664.  
 Roe, Theodore W., O52205.  
 Rogers, James LeR., O22076.  
 Rollins, Albert F., O21823.  
 Rolph, Herbert F., O32091.  
 Ronan, Charles E., O43750.  
 Roosa, James A., O22138.  
 Rose, Ralph E., O32079.  
 Routledge, Rodham C., O40143.  
 Royce, Philip M., O21814.  
 Rundquist, Eric A., O43843.  
 Rutledge, Hugh M., O32201.  
 Ryneska, Joseph F., O32017.  
 Saffold, Eugene, O43660.  
 St. Clair, Howard B., O22017.  
 Salada, Reuben N., O32261.  
 Sandell, Bertil B., O32153.  
 Sapp, John D., O32109.  
 Saxe, Robert K., O43790.  
 Schellman, Robert H., O22002.  
 Schiltz, Howard F., O38956.  
 Schmidt, Herman A., O52322.  
 Scholl, William P. Jr., O32281.  
 Schoonover, James F., O32304.  
 Schrader, John R., Jr., O21818.  
 Schroeder, Edgar W., O22166.  
 Schwenk, James T. L., O22106.  
 Scott, Emmett G., O43760.  
 Scott, John B., O32213.  
 Scott, Kenneth L., O22121.  
 Scott, Lionel E., O32046.  
 Scott, Robert S., O43712.  
 Scroggs, John P., O21863.  
 Seaburn, Eugene T., O32314.  
 Seaver, Philip R., O21916.  
 Seekins, Earl I., O32362.  
 Seifert, Raymond A., O52253.  
 Serrem, Edward MacD., O22090.  
 Shanley, Thomas J. B., O21828.  
 Sharp, Robert W., O43678.  
 Sharpe, Harold H., O43682.  
 Shepard, Claude L., Jr., O21931.  
 Shepherd, James McM., O21868.  
 Showalter, Wilbur E., O21794.  
 Shultz, Vester M., O21974.  
 Simon, Lincoln A., O21961.  
 Simpson, Donald M., O21936.  
 Sinclair, Lachlan M., O32369.  
 Skillman, Charles S., O38989.  
 Slad, Harry A., O32088.  
 Slomp, Jack B., O43608.  
 Slover, Robert H., O43638.  
 Small, Arthur C., O52214.  
 Smith, Byron S., O43860.  
 Smith, Charles B., O22113.  
 Smith, David C., Jr., O43394.  
 Smith, Edward P., O22063.  
 Smith, Francis J., Jr., O43826.  
 Smith, Harry T., O22001.  
 Smith, James W., O32128.  
 Smith, Matthew C., O22038.  
 Smith, Richard S., O32305.  
 Smith, Woods B., O43438.  
 Solomon, Edward M., O32351.  
 Sory, Carl G., O43670.  
 Specht, James T., Jr., O32321.  
 Spiedel, Robert C., Jr., O32044.  
 Spragins, Robert B., O22080.  
 Stahler, Charles L., O32197.  
 Staley, Mortimer R., O43620.  
 Stanford, William A., O43808.  
 Staver, Robert LeR., O43650.  
 Steckla, Paul R., O32366.  
 Stegall, Oscar, Jr., O32014.  
 Stoddard, Ayres W., O43652.  
 Stotlar, William G., O43662.  
 Studer, Robert W., O21786.  
 Sullivan, Robert E., O43745.  
 Sullivan, William B., O20352.  
 Sutton, Alexander G., Jr., O43663.  
 Swett, Daniel H., O38984.  
 Taranto, Salvador F., O40372.  
 Taylor, Livingston N., Jr., O21853.  
 Taylor, Robert R., Jr., O31619.  
 Teaboldt, Chase R., O32082.  
 Teeters, Bernard G., O22081.  
 Tenhagen, Carl B., O43785.  
 Thomason, Joel F., O21867.  
 Thompson, Robert M., O43794.  
 Thrasher, Warren A., O32733.

Tomlin, John W., Jr., O32249.  
 Trahan, Eugene A., O21967.  
 Trimble, Aaron U., O43675.  
 Troiano, Constant A., O22180.  
 Turner, Ian F., O32318.  
 Tuttle, Paul V., Jr., O21896.  
 Twomey, Lawrence A., O32126.  
 Tyler, John S., O43602.  
 Ullans, Roman I., O52302.  
 Urban, John G., O21825.  
 VanCourt, Lloyd P., O38966.  
 Vandenberg, Robert E., O38979.  
 Van Harlingen, William M., Jr., O22016.  
 Vann, Walter MacR., O21812.  
 Veale, Joseph E., O21435.  
 Veatch, John E., O32047.  
 Vinson, Frank M., Jr., O31990.  
 Von Benge, Herman H., O32237.  
 von Rohr, Arthur D., O43774.  
 Wald, John J., O21804.  
 Wales, John E., 3d, O40315.  
 Walker, Jack K., O32225.  
 Walker, Joel T., O22007.  
 Walker, John W., O22011.  
 Wallace, Kenneth W., O32338.  
 Wallace, Lee, O32065.  
 Wallace, Milton I., O21467.  
 Wallach, Marshall, O21977.  
 Waller, Marvin E., O40294.  
 Wardner, Wallace C., O52212.  
 Ware, Lawrence R., O52317.  
 Warren, Shields, Jr., O22103.  
 Watt, John, O21901.  
 Way, David W., O32341.  
 Weaver, Maynard B., O32120.  
 Webster, Montgomery L., O21751.  
 Weigand, Jack L., O32315.  
 Weisemann, Heinz, O21956.  
 Wells, Walter J., O21736.  
 Wendorf, Hulen D., O21919.  
 Wendt, Walter W., O32190.  
 West, William W., 3d, O21922.  
 Whipple, John L., O43714.  
 White, Howard S., O32041.  
 Whitehead, Arthur K., O43612.  
 Wickboldt, Walter C., O22047.  
 Wicker, Karl J., O32033.  
 Wikoff, William H., O32301.  
 Wilcox, Leslie R., O32251.  
 Wild, Herman B., O40333.  
 Willey, Wilford L., O38961.  
 Williams, Frank von P., O40334.  
 Williams, Gardner A., O40301.  
 Williams, George W., O32077.  
 Williams, Robert C., O40352.  
 Williams, Robert C., Jr., O22091.  
 Williams, Robert M., O21801.  
 Williams, Walter H., O38967.  
 Wills, Lloyd E., O32060.  
 Wilson, Franklin L., O32350.  
 Wilson, Harold G., O32370.  
 Wilson, Jasper J., O21829.  
 Wilson, Lawrence M., O38978.  
 Wilson, Paul F., O38971.  
 Wilson, Weldon W., O32054.  
 Wilson, Woodrow W., O21755.  
 Winegar, Walter L., O21764.  
 Winton, George P., Jr., O21819.  
 Wisdom, Wiley B., Jr., O21985.  
 Witte, Carl G., O32303.  
 Witter, Vincent M., O32172.  
 Wohlfell, Carl H., O21907.  
 Wolfe, Richard D., O21743.  
 Wolfson, Jack D., O40307.  
 Wood, Benjamin F., O32001.  
 Wood, Oliver E., O21998.  
 Woodrow, Charles E., O32011.  
 Wright, Frederick S., Jr., O21328.  
 Wyatt, William L., O32310.  
 Yarnall, Kenneth L., O21864.  
 Young, Robert W., O31891.  
 Yow, John W., O32361.  
 Zeoli, Richard F., O32345.  
 Zitzer, Frederick, O21444.

*To be lieutenant colonels, chaplains*

Ames, Kenneth L., O30864.  
 Anderson, Wilber K., O43126.  
 Chapdelaine, Albert J., O51956.  
 Heuer, Herman H., O30895.  
 Hundley, Maury, Jr., O26424.  
 Junger, Richard W., Jr., O25850.

Kendall, Rex S., O43123.  
 Knight, Lonnie W., O30885.  
 Lock, Gregory J., O51957.  
 Marsh, Arthur H., O26441.  
 Murphy, Charles J., O30879.  
 Rhea, John L., O43117.  
 Schliesser, Luther G. H., O40099.  
 Sparks, John W., O30900.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps*

Elliott, Robin, L64.  
 Lyons, Catherine J., L73.  
 Miller, Edna R., L38.  
 Ochoa, Lois W., L63.  
 Rutledge, Elizabeth A., L59.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps*

Bauer, Albert J., O25839.  
 Bauer, Frank L., O26430.  
 Beckjord, Philip R., O31051.  
 Bell, James A., O26452.  
 Bell, Robert F., O63470.  
 Bernucci, Robert J., O63148.  
 Blair, Joseph R., O52007.  
 Bogosian, Armen, O62895.  
 Brackett, Morris E., O25162.  
 Brennan, John J., O31150.  
 Brown, William J., O24315.  
 Buchanan, Arren C., Jr., O63709.  
 Campbell, Donald, O31122.  
 Cavendar, Savino W., O31005.  
 Christianson, Charles S., O56824.  
 Collins, William A., Jr., O58178.  
 Cooch, Joseph W., O63707.  
 Cressler, John C., O25157.  
 Dalley, Jeremiah A., O58242.  
 Dein, Harry L., O58752.  
 Dunnington, William G., O61059.  
 Eaker, Alan B., O43146.  
 Edwards, Walton M., O24377.  
 Evans, Jon P., O52010.  
 Finch, Charles S., Jr., O61169.  
 Flinter, Marcus H., O61168.  
 Francis, Donald J., O59423.  
 Giesecke, Carl G., O63469.  
 Goldstein, Joseph D., O62894.  
 Gonzalez-Rodriguez, Juan, O58014.  
 Gronbeck, Christian, Jr., O26470.  
 Harris, John F., O58751.  
 Hoeftler, Hugh B., O51983.  
 Hoffman, Charles W., Jr., O58243.  
 Hollingsworth, Charles E., O58075.  
 Hornisher, Charles J., O26461.  
 Hume, Wayne S., O59422.  
 Jennings, Hal B., Jr., O26995.  
 Jesurun, Harold M., O26439.  
 Kiehl, Paul V., O26397.  
 King, Everett G., O61170.  
 Lanard, Francis W., O25155.  
 Lane, Thomas H., O51992.  
 Lull, George F., Jr., O31114.  
 MacMillan, Karl D., O63822.  
 Maret, Raymond, O63666.  
 Markowitz, Isidor, O59511.  
 McNeerney, Jules J., O26453.  
 Meyer, Jules O., O60014.  
 Miller, Sidney, O60015.  
 Montgomery, Albert E., O57698.  
 Moore, Bernard J., O58685.  
 Moring, John B., O25424.  
 Mulholland, Richard F., O31124.  
 Neeseman, Arthur C., O57816.  
 Neiman, Watson E., O31072.  
 Noel, Philip J., Jr., O25164.  
 Opsahl, Harold E., O61057.  
 Orr, Kenneth D., O31042.  
 Perlmutter, Nick, O60731.  
 Pfeiffer, John F., O26468.  
 Pickhardt, Woodrow L., O39497.  
 Plum, John B., O61929.  
 Psaki, Raoul C., Jr., O26467.  
 Ransom, Charles H., O25841.  
 Ratcliffe, Harold E., O56840.  
 Rogers, Frank B., O26466.  
 Rogers, James T., O58074.  
 Roque, Francisco T., O63704.  
 Sandifer, Samuel H., O25158.  
 Schrader, Paul J., O62897.  
 Scoles, Peter S., O63705.  
 Smith, Max L., O38853.  
 Sprinz, Helmut, O30919.

Stalk, Theodore, O63208.  
 Steele, Lowell R., O25167.  
 Steer, Arthur, O57815.  
 Stein, William, O63775.  
 Stokes, Robert C., O57887.  
 Sumner, John W., Jr., O31133.  
 Tackett, Orville H., O58683.  
 Tegtmeyer, Charles E., O63706.  
 Tenery, John H., O43172.  
 Thalmann, William G., Jr., O24303.  
 Throm, Urban L., 2d, O26465.  
 Tillotson, James K., O52001.  
 Timmerman, Frederick W., O63210.  
 Travis, LeRoy O., O24368.  
 Twineham, Walter C., O24635.  
 Vaughan, Sanford M., O60732.  
 Vita, Frank J., O59664.  
 Vogel, Edward H., Jr., O24321.  
 Wallace, John K., 2d, O31131.  
 Weeks, Bertram A., O26368.  
 Whiteley, Edward J., O24627.  
 Wilson, William J., Jr., O57701.  
 Ziperman, H. Haskell, O63149.  
 Zuelzer, Wilhelm A., O60730.

*To be Lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps*

Boudreaux, Raymond E., O23344.  
 Brown, Pearson W., O23610.  
 Chase, Edward D., O30936.  
 Chipps, James E., O22743.  
 Garner, James R., O30933.  
 Hazard, David C., O24335.  
 Lister, Franklin S., O22747.  
 Madden, Raymond H., O30950.  
 Montgomery, Lee E., O30958.  
 Moser, Ernest H., O30960.  
 Ogie, Merle W., O22261.  
 Powers, Walter J., O24369.  
 Ramage, Chester K., O23348.  
 Snyder, Harry G., O38854.  
 Tornstrom, Clifford H., O43138.  
 Walsh, Robert L., O23677.

*To be Lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps*

Christensen, Nels F., O40100.  
 Crawford, James P., O30906.  
 Gollehon, Charles W., O30918.  
 Hasson, David S., O22884.  
 Sibert, Herbert F., O30922.

*To be Lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps*

Adams, Harry J., O43191.  
 Andersen, Herman S., O31265.  
 Anderson, Edward J., Jr., O31256.  
 Antley, Hampton L., O31107.  
 Austin, Paul F., O43213.  
 Baker, Thomas E., O31244.  
 Blythe, Vernon E., O40133.  
 Brandt, Jerome N., O31245.  
 Burns, John E., O31205.  
 Clary, John J., O31103.  
 Correll, Walter D., O40122.  
 Covey, William T., O31100.  
 Cummings, Harold L., O31194.  
 Curtis, George B., O31129.  
 Czaja, Rudolph P., O31267.  
 Darling, James O., O31271.  
 Davis, Chester H., O31182.  
 Egger, Floyd C., O52065.  
 Foster, Ivan M., O31215.  
 Freeman, Richard R., O56189.  
 Grove, Lee A., O56187.  
 Gruver, George A., O31207.  
 Hack, Vincent I., O43206.  
 Hampton, Wade F., O43190.  
 Hitchings, Donald L., O52081.  
 Homs, Jose M., O31249.  
 Houser, Jack, O31263.  
 Ingram, James L., O31201.  
 Irving, Glenn C., O43197.  
 James, Willard W., O31167.  
 Johnston, George W., O31184.  
 Jones, Gordon A., O31090.  
 Kegerreis, John B., O31242.  
 La Fors, Claud D., O21704.  
 LeMoon, Ralph G., O31264.  
 Lewis, Converse R., Jr., O43203.  
 McAlpine, Arthur R., O56188.  
 McCaslin, Kermit J., O31096.  
 McIntyre, Edward J., O31152.  
 Molyneaux, Harold G., O56193.

Montague, Ernest K., O56890.  
 Moore, Arlice J., O31154.  
 Mudgett, Louis E., O31069.  
 Nedds, Ivan L., O31268.  
 Nibbelink, Arlon B., O31246.  
 Nicolary, Carl W., O31226.  
 Oettinger, Vernon S., O31262.  
 Peake, Ben F., O31168.  
 Peterson, Emmett L., O31138.  
 Ransom, John P., O31140.  
 Rawlins, William A., O31258.  
 Roerig, Richard N., O43180.  
 Rustigian, Barj A., O31068.  
 Shealey, Percy R., O31164.  
 Sheridan, John W., O43156.  
 Smith, Marlo E., O56924.  
 Stack, Andrew J., O31126.  
 Steed, Oliver H., O43177.  
 Strode, Alfred C., O40129.  
 Sweet, Fred W., Jr., O31266.  
 Taro, Alfred L., O56882.  
 Tatch, David, O31116.  
 Taylor, Victor B., O40130.  
 Vire, Howard F., O56923.  
 Wiley, Irving B., O31132.  
 Wilkin, Wendell R., O52080.  
 Wright, Elwood M., O31192.  
 Yates, Virgil T., O52069.

*To be majors*

Aaron, Harold R., O26207.  
 Abernathy, William C., O37308.  
 Adams, Dwight L., O36323.  
 Adams, Harold D., O37281.  
 Adie, John R., O47634.  
 Agers, Robert D., O40905.  
 Albright, Charles R., O36502.  
 Aleveras, James A., O25835.  
 Alexander, George L., O26021.  
 Alfano, Charles F., O25640.  
 Ancker, Jack P., O37217.  
 Anders, Charles T., O36679.  
 Anderson, Edward G., Jr., O36391.  
 Anderson, Gordon V., O47345.  
 Anderson, John V., O36984.  
 Anderson, Jonathan W., Jr., O25820.  
 Anderson, Ralph C., O54269.  
 Anderson, Ralph W., O36305.  
 Antonilli, Virginio L., O25663.  
 Aquilina, Raymond F., O36782.  
 Archer, Theodore W., O48383.  
 Ardery, Edward R., O25503.  
 Armstrong, John W., O25686.  
 Arn, Robert M., O48366.  
 Arnold, William E., Jr., O36388.  
 Arthur, Robert E., O40968.  
 Ash, Laurence W., O54165.  
 Askey, Robert F., O47707.  
 Atkinson, Quintus C., O26317.  
 Aurit, Samuel, O47925.  
 Austin, George A., Jr., O25420.  
 Avery, Philip S., O36241.  
 Baatz, David C., O41048.  
 Baber, Ben L., O25567.  
 Baden, Robert E., O25671.  
 Baen, Spencer R., O27005.  
 Balcer, Charles L., O36519.  
 Baldwin, Clarke T., Jr., O26037.  
 Baltes, Paul A., O39285.  
 Bammer, Wyndham H., O36903.  
 Barber, Henry A., 3d, O25568.  
 Barber, Robert K., O36728.  
 Barickman, Robert J., O25932.  
 Barkovich, Anthony, O54530.  
 Barner, John H., O36700.  
 Barnhart, Frank H., Jr., O36516.  
 Barracough, Donald F., O36996.  
 Barrett, Laurence O., O36652.  
 Barrett, Robert F., Jr., O37161.  
 Barrios, Willie W. J., O36748.  
 Bass, Roy H., Jr., O39311.  
 Bates, James M., O36565.  
 Batson, Richard T., O25434.  
 Baughman, Claude G., O37173.  
 Beach, John B., O25978.  
 Beem, Samuel M., O54685.  
 Beightler, Robert S., Jr., O25642.  
 Bell, Benjamin C., O48708.  
 Bell, John C., O25937.  
 Bellino, Joe O., Jr., O41047.  
 Bennett, Edward E., O25463.  
 Bennett, Ralph O., O36860.  
 Benson, Charles E., O26263.  
 Benson, Joseph W., O25601.  
 Berenzweig, Marvin J., O25811.  
 Berger, Casper, O41052.  
 Berte, Samuel C., O48711.  
 Bertram, Roger A., O25508.  
 Betts, George, O26204.  
 Betts, James A., O25891.  
 Bibby, William L., O26276.  
 Bielecki, Edward J., O25465.  
 Bisset, David A., Jr., O47274.  
 Bixby, Willis W., O36104.  
 Black, Garland C., Jr., O26106.  
 Black, Joseph E., O39268.  
 Blackwell, John L., O36378.  
 Blair, John D., 3d, O37272.  
 Blake, Robert T., O25837.  
 Blakely, Larry A., O36426.  
 Blanchett, Leo M., Jr., O25585.  
 Blatt, Raymond C., Jr., O26186.  
 Bliss, Arthur McC., O36852.  
 Bloecker, Victor, Jr., O41058.  
 Blount, LeVerne E., O25939.  
 Blum, Charles K., O36898.  
 Blume, Robert F., O37024.  
 Boatner, Mark M., 3d, O26248.  
 Bockoven, Frederic T., O37354.  
 Bogan, Lucian D., Jr., O25810.  
 Boller, Quellen D., O26050.  
 Bolling, Alexander R., Jr., O26066.  
 Bond, John B., O26077.  
 Botts, Luther B., O36752.  
 Bowden, Henry C., Jr., O47536.  
 Boyd, William H., O37205.  
 Boyea, Gerald E., O37258.  
 Boyer, Richard J., O37202.  
 Boyle, Harry F., O39258.  
 Boyle, Joseph F., O26347.  
 Brabson, William H., Jr., O26069.  
 Brady, John S., O26064.  
 Brandt, Roland A., O25901.  
 Branson, Roy E., O37149.  
 Branton, Harold M., O37345.  
 Bray, Edward, O48259.  
 Breitenbach, Frank P., O26365.  
 Bressler, Howard E., O40967.  
 Brier, John K., O26185.  
 Brigham, Robert L., O37326.  
 Bright, Charles W., O37159.  
 Brill, Heber C., O26162.  
 Brindley, Arthur F., O36504.  
 Brinson, Arthur, O47740.  
 Briscoe, William T., O54688.  
 Britt, Robert C., O54425.  
 Brooks, Waldo W., Jr., O54679.  
 Brown, George H., O48840.  
 Brown, Luther E., O27054.  
 Brown, Percy D., Jr., O37255.  
 Brown, Stephen O., O26105.  
 Bryant, Harold F., O36886.  
 Bryant, Robert E., O54484.  
 Buchanan, Earl W., O36352.  
 Buchanan, Russell B., Jr., O37291.  
 Buell, Kenneth E., O25772.  
 Buelow, Wallace R., O36319.  
 Bugg, George G., O26175.  
 Bullard, Robert L., 3d, O25774.  
 Burdett, Allen M., Jr., O26048.  
 Burgasser, Francis X., O37061.  
 Burlin, Robert B., O25484.  
 Burr, Charles H., Jr., O25758.  
 Burr, Edward, 2d, O26009.  
 Burrows, Robert E., Jr., O25918.  
 Burt, William A., O36940.  
 Buth, William H., O54312.  
 Butler, Farley P., Sr., O39321.  
 Butler, James W., O54157.  
 Butler, John L., O40980.  
 Butterfield, John L., O26194.  
 Buyers, John F., O25862.  
 Buzalski, Ernest A., O25906.  
 Byrne, Robert G., O36854.  
 Byrnes, Laurence G., O54163.  
 Bzdek, Beverly M., O39269.  
 Cabassa, Jaime L., O48569.  
 Cain, James W., O26208.  
 Calnan, William M., O26120.  
 Calvert, Ross H., Jr., O47933.  
 Camp, Eugene C., O37072.  
 Campbell, George T., Jr., O26084.  
 Campbell, Robert H., O26074.  
 Canning, Austin J., Jr., O26277.



- Cantlay, George G., Jr., O25979.  
 Caple, Dayton F., O49054.  
 Carberry, Edmund J., O25565.  
 Carey, Robert E., O47519.  
 Carroll, Benjamin L., O37321.  
 Carter, Hamlet R., Jr., O26134.  
 Carter, William C., O54761.  
 Carter, William C., Jr., O37290.  
 Casey, Edgar L., O36324.  
 Cawthra, James H., O36981.  
 Challen, Henry G., O40902.  
 Chance, Francis A., Jr., O36784.  
 Changaris, James S., O25819.  
 Chapin, Neil McK., O55006.  
 Chase, David M., O26212.  
 Chase, James E., O47642.  
 Chaufy, Joseph V., O25969.  
 Chesebro, John S., O47284.  
 Chessnoe, Michael, O48968.  
 Chmar, Paul, O37640.  
 Christy, James V., O25909.  
 Churchwell, Alvin McL., O41055.  
 Clark, Howard L., O40928.  
 Clark, Lyman H., O37019.  
 Clark, Robert W., O26032.  
 Clark, William K., O41001.  
 Cleary, Edward R., O26304.  
 Cleary, Louis X., O54965.  
 Cleveland, Robert E., O36684.  
 Clifford, Richard W., O36761.  
 Cline, Charles L., O36543.  
 Clyde, Gordon F., O47271.  
 Coady, Gerald G., O54223.  
 Cobb, James J., O25629.  
 Cobb, John H., Jr., O26233.  
 Cobey, Earl J., O54909.  
 Cochran, Collins L., O40964.  
 Cochran, John H., Jr., O54787.  
 Cochran, John H., Jr., O26115.  
 Coffman, Howard B., Jr., O25941.  
 Cole, Caleb A., O26171.  
 Cole, Charles B., Jr., O39304.  
 Collins, John W., 3d., O26079.  
 Conard, David B., O25885.  
 Conarty, Roger L., O26067.  
 Conmy, Joseph B., Jr., O25645.  
 Connolly, George L., Jr., O36666.  
 Conway, Lewis W., O37021.  
 Cook, Robert M., O25690.  
 Cook, Walter H., Jr., O25466.  
 Cool, William C., O54108.  
 Coonly, William J., Jr., O36724.  
 Cosgrove, Gerard V., O25683.  
 Cover, William W., O26287.  
 Cox, Charles T., O36699.  
 Cox, Emmett W., Jr., O37200.  
 Crane, Hal P., Jr., O54794.  
 Creighton, James R., O36498.  
 Croonquist, Arvid P., Jr., O25639.  
 Crowe, Robert E., O47805.  
 Cullinane, Daniel B., Jr., O26145.  
 Cumbie, Walter P., O54718.  
 Cunningham, Donald H., O36799.  
 Cunningham, Hubert S., O39303.  
 Cunningham, Robert K., O37120.  
 Curry, James A., Jr., O54865.  
 Curtin, Paul J., O26361.  
 Curtis, Elbert R., O36547.  
 Curtis, Wesley J., O25792.  
 Dadisman, Chester E., O36497.  
 Daems, Leonard R., Jr., O47270.  
 Dakin, Myron H., O25733.  
 Daley, Edward J., O36418.  
 Danforth, Robert D., O26081.  
 Darden, James R., O26142.  
 Davenport, Robert J., O26089.  
 Davidson, Paul W., O54119.  
 Davidson, Shirley, O37122.  
 Davis, Claiborne W., Jr., O37001.  
 Davis, Mike B., O26188.  
 Davis, Paul A., Jr., O36887.  
 Davis, Paul W., O36375.  
 Davis, Robert Lev., O25661.  
 Davis, Young J., O47572.  
 Deadwyler, William H., Jr., O36298.  
 Deaver, John Q., O54765.  
 DeBow, Duane L., O40970.  
 DeBrocke, William P., O25986.  
 deCamp, John T., Jr., O26040.  
 Deekle, William C., Jr., O26310.  
 DeGiovanni, Joseph I., O36866.  
 Dehner, Vernon E., O37147.  
 Del Zoppo, Roger A., O39243.  
 Dennison, Robert C., Jr., O49010.  
 Des Jarlais, Robert W., O47377.  
 Dettmar, Henry G., O37117.  
 Dickinson, Charles W., O26033.  
 Dickson, Jean H., O36606.  
 Dingwall, Allan G., Jr., O37249.  
 Dirkes, Francis J., O25877.  
 Doerfler, Eugene A., O37211.  
 Dollard, Edmund J., O47369.  
 Donahue, Franklyn W., O41071.  
 Donahue, Patrick H., O36985.  
 Donaldson, Thomas Q., O25480.  
 Donnelly, Ross I., O36533.  
 Donovan, Charles W., O36500.  
 Doran, Edward A., O25782.  
 Dornacker, Charles H., O36370.  
 Dowell, Richard W., O39225.  
 Dozier, William T., O48008.  
 Drinkard, Harry V., O40898.  
 Drum, Vernon B., O39318.  
 Duffy, Jack W., O37349.  
 Duke, Robert C., O36697.  
 Duke, Thomas A., Jr., O37062.  
 Dunn, James E., O36137.  
 Dunstan, Henry V., O40953.  
 Dunwoody, Harold H., O26197.  
 Durbon, Roy C., O37219.  
 Duvall, Clifford P., O39270.  
 Dwan, Robert D., O26052.  
 Dworak, John L., O25757.  
 Dyke, Harold H., Jr., O53334.  
 Dysinger, William C., O54976.  
 Eager, George, Jr., O36766.  
 Earnest, Clyde T., O25923.  
 Eastham, Warren C., O37025.  
 Ebrey, Henry J., Jr., O25627.  
 Eddy, George G., Jr., O54991.  
 Edrington, Bethell, O26329.  
 Elsler, Walter J., O36919.  
 Ellingsworth, James B., Jr., O47793.  
 Elliott, Howard D., O25445.  
 Elliott, Mayo J., O26179.  
 Erdman, George W., O37350.  
 Ernst, Russell W., O37256.  
 Erskine, Jasper N., O36768.  
 Evans, Edward J., O37374.  
 Ewald, William, O36949.  
 Falck, William D., O25893.  
 Farley, Clare F., O25915.  
 Farnsworth, Frank A., O37216.  
 Faust, Edmond L., Jr., O25450.  
 Ferrell, Robert M., O53830.  
 Field, Kenneth S., O36932.  
 Files, Vernon, O37086.  
 Finlayson, Harold C., O41028.  
 Finney, Perry S., Jr., O48263.  
 Fischgrund, Harold S., O37183.  
 Fishback, Jesse LeR., O25858.  
 Fliss, Robert E., O25511.  
 Flanagan, John J., O47734.  
 Flatley, Thomas W., O25638.  
 Fleury, Vernon G., O48249.  
 Flint, Robert P., O40921.  
 Fox, George F., O36234.  
 Fox, Ogden R., O47943.  
 Fraleigh, Charles S., Jr., O36862.  
 Francisco, Louis S., O26280.  
 Frank, Fred J., O54078.  
 Frankenstein, Leonard S., O54172.  
 Franklin, Victor A., O25653.  
 Fraser, Bruce H., O37276.  
 Frauenheim, Walter G., Jr., O48978.  
 Frazier, Frank W., O37085.  
 Frederick, Floyd, O36243.  
 Fredericks, Edgar J., O26302.  
 Fredericks, John L., O47721.  
 Freer, Arthur L., O25451.  
 Freestone, James E., O36937.  
 French, Jack S., O48380.  
 Fritz, William H., O25620.  
 Fromme, Robert J., O39246.  
 Fry, Ernest M., O48666.  
 Fuller, Ellis LeR., O37366.  
 Fuller, Hiram G., O25936.  
 Fulmer, John M., O47846.  
 Fulton, William B., O25385.  
 Gardner, Ralph V., O39236.  
 Garten, Melvin, O48990.  
 Gean, Kirby A., O25588.  
 Geaney, Edward J., Jr., O26328.  
 Geelan, William R., O40963.  
 Gehring, Frederick R., O36462.  
 Gibbons, Murray F., Jr., O54398.  
 Gibson, James McK., O48730.  
 Giffin, Stewart S., Jr., O26342.  
 Gilbert, Harold N., Jr., O37307.  
 Gilbert, Stanley K., O47926.  
 Giles, Warren A., O37874.  
 Gingrich, Harold W., O26076.  
 Glasgow, William M., Jr., O25905.  
 Glendening, James K., O26176.  
 Glick, John R., O48877.  
 Glickson, Solomon P., O54079.  
 Glisson, Roy, Jr., O37078.  
 Glotzbach, Edgar N., O27011.  
 Goggans, Robert, O49051.  
 Gohmert, Roland L., Jr., O35402.  
 Goldenthal, Mitchel, O25482.  
 Goodlett, John G., Jr., O54600.  
 Goodman, Glenn W., O54171.  
 Goodman, Jess L., O47795.  
 Gordy, Stephen E., O26125.  
 Gorman, Vincent J., O41019.  
 Gossett, Henry M., O36941.  
 Gottlieb, Richard E., O48309.  
 Gould, George H., O55058.  
 Grace, Arthur B., Jr., O25498.  
 Grady, Ronan C., Jr., O25985.  
 Gray, Thomas E., O47851.  
 Green, George E., O40983.  
 Greene, James F., Jr., O25900.  
 Greenleaf, Dale R., O36476.  
 Greenwalt, William J., O25998.  
 Greiner, Robert J., O54034.  
 Grice, Thorpe C., O26326.  
 Griess, Thomas E., O25533.  
 Griffin, Bobbie A., O25938.  
 Grimm, Henry F., Jr., O25519.  
 Grissom, Thomas C., Jr., O46263.  
 Groom, Kenneth G., O54786.  
 Grunzweig, Nicholas J., O47845.  
 Hahn, William R., O25566.  
 Hakala, Robert W., O48852.  
 Haley, Norman R., O36911.  
 Hall, Alphon W., O54490.  
 Hall, Chester A., Jr., O48018.  
 Hall, Claude H., O47794.  
 Hall, Frederick W., O47574.  
 Hallock, Richard R., O37367.  
 Hamblen, Archelaus L., Jr., O26187.  
 Hanchey, Charles W., O36889.  
 Hand, Robert, O36415.  
 Handley, George E., Jr., O37294.  
 Hanifen, Thomas J., O40926.  
 Harding, Leslie B., O25512.  
 Hardy, Leslie B., O26003.  
 Harrigan, William F., O36438.  
 Harris, Elva, O36714.  
 Harth, John F., O36897.  
 Hash, William A., O36625.  
 Hastie, William L., O54089.  
 Hatch, Robert F., O54234.  
 Hawkins, Wallace E., O40969.  
 Hawthorne, Frank, O54194.  
 Hayes, Leo V., O26213.  
 Hayes, Robert L., O41016.  
 Hazel, Charles E., O39260.  
 Head, Harold S., O26272.  
 Healy, John D., Jr., O25715.  
 Hecker, Warren R., O26292.  
 Helms, Kenneth R., O37023.  
 Helsley, Llewellyn S., O36900.  
 Heltzel, Charles L., O25746.  
 Henderson, Chester T., O39274.  
 Henderson, Tony S., O39279.  
 Henry, Gregg, O25574.  
 Hensel, William E., O25531.  
 Henson, Ira C., Jr., O36423.  
 Herold, John W., O36548.  
 Herres, Fred W., Jr., O25996.  
 Herres, Harry L., O41049.  
 Hershey, Charles G., Jr., O37364.  
 Hevener, James W., O37121.  
 Hiatt, Charles R., O37099.  
 Hickman, Charles T., O47948.  
 Higgins, James L., O36306.  
 Higgins, Joseph P., O48665.  
 Hill, David A., Jr., O54124.  
 Hill, Ralph J., O26127.  
 Hochella, Michael F., O36480.

Hoffman, Ralph W., O36786.  
 Hofmann, Ralph M., O25495.  
 Hogan, James H., O37144.  
 Holder, Leonard D., O37267.  
 Holland, William E., Jr., O48873.  
 Holman, Jefferson T., O36987.  
 Holmes, Robert M., O26110.  
 Holt, John B., Jr., O48996.  
 Hood, Burton F., Jr., O25729.  
 Hoplin, Herman P., O36975.  
 Horton, Paul N., O36254.  
 Hubert, Enrique J., O36518.  
 Huck, Terence W., O36513.  
 Huddleston, James McC., O25554.  
 Huggins, Lloyd G., O36139.  
 Hughes, Algin J., O25630.  
 Hughes, Clyde E., O48881.  
 Hughes, John P. M., O47232.  
 Humphrey, Charles Van-B., O40945.  
 Hunnicut, John O., Jr., O36380.  
 Hunt, George T., O36777.  
 Hunt, Herman T., Jr., O26053.  
 Hunter, William L., O49016.  
 Hutchin, Walter J., O25916.  
 Hyde, John F., O36905.  
 Hyle, Archie R., O37271.  
 Hymers, Charles S., O48228.  
 Ingle, Paul T., O37329.  
 Ingwersen, Glenn P., O25993.  
 Inman, Lloyd J., O36274.  
 Ippolito, Charles J., O37208.  
 Ireland, Thornton E., O37325.  
 Irving, John H., Jr., O27004.  
 Isaacs, Alvin C., O48816.  
 Ivan, Gabriel A., O25865.  
 Jackson, Joseph J., O39265.  
 Jackson, Kenneth E., O36349.  
 Jalbert, Donald J., O26309.  
 James, Lee B., O25619.  
 James, Stanley L., Jr., O25833.  
 Jeffries, John H., O36427.  
 Jemmott, Arthur H., Jr., O37043.  
 Johnson, Earle A., Jr., O26211.  
 Johnson, James M., O54002.  
 Johnson, John F., O25538.  
 Johnston, Thomas M., O25942.  
 Johnston, William R., O47363.  
 Jones, Alan W., Jr., O25868.  
 Jones, Charles M., Jr., O25890.  
 Jones, Pearl F., O48423.  
 Jones, Harry L., Jr., O48397.  
 Jones, Ralph K., O26123.  
 Jones, Russell G., O37213.  
 Jones, William M., O37209.  
 Jordan, Edward E., O54028.  
 Joyner, Archie B., Jr., O54001.  
 Kajencki, Francis C., O25582.  
 Kapp, Ronald A., O37070.  
 Karnes, Howard L., O36515.  
 Karrick, Samuel N., Jr., O25446.  
 Kasserman, Harold W., O48070.  
 Katz, Sidney, O26327.  
 Kauffman, Eldeen H., O39257.  
 Kaufmann, Paul R., O36377.  
 Keating, William J., O36503.  
 Keene, Leonard L., Jr., O36529.  
 Kellogg, Dimitri A., O25433.  
 Kelly, John J., Jr., O25869.  
 Kelly, Randall, O47876.  
 Kemp, Herbert E., O25742.  
 Kendall, Maurice W., O27003.  
 Kengle, Lansford F., O25975.  
 Kennedy, Arthur H., O39300.  
 Kennedy, Richard T., O48390.  
 Kennedy, Stanley Y., Jr., O37179.  
 Kennedy, William M., O36640.  
 Keown, James LeR., O36528.  
 Kerr, Gerald L., Jr., O41033.  
 Key, Herbert L., Jr., O54858.  
 Kidd, William T., O48216.  
 Kidder, James D., O26227.  
 Kinnes, Ralph, O36800.  
 Kirchner, Alfred W., O36559.  
 Kissam, Richard V., Jr., O36339.  
 Kittrell, William S., O49082.  
 Klein, Donald A., O36668.  
 Klekas, Louis J., O54883.  
 Klie, Harry K., O47792.  
 Koch, Bruce C., O25947.  
 Koenig, William A., Jr., O40906.  
 Kolb, James T., O47708.

Kolesar, Armand M., O36783.  
 Kranc, Robert T., O36667.  
 Kreml, Edward A., O26283.  
 Krieger, Mervin, O49000.  
 Kruger, Richard O., O36575.  
 Kuffner, John E., O25602.  
 La Chaussee, Charles E., O37164.  
 Lacouture, Arthur J., Jr., O26240.  
 Ladner, Gerard J., O37143.  
 Landrum, Eugene M., Jr., O55032.  
 Lanen, William J., O36907.  
 Langland, Lawrence Q., O39238.  
 Langley, Warren G., O55029.  
 Langstaff, James D., O26314.  
 Langston, Alex T., Jr., O55069.  
 La Patka, Thomas M., O36646.  
 Larned, Royce P., O55108.  
 Larsen, Gerald E., O36893.  
 Laughlin, Virgil V., O41059.  
 Leach, James H., O48718.  
 Leach, Ross E., O54970.  
 Lee, Oscar W., Jr., O36670.  
 LeFebvre, Henry E., O36358.  
 Leister, Albert F., Jr., O36201.  
 Levasseur, Armand R., O47280.  
 Lewis, Herbert S., O25734.  
 Lewis, Norman F., O48701.  
 Light, Morgan C., O36773.  
 Lindsey, Morris L., O40935.  
 Lingam, William J., O48851.  
 Lingner, Frederick A., O36387.  
 Linton, William C., Jr., O26140.  
 Lochrie, Wilmer R., O36936.  
 Lork, Horace C., O36359.  
 Losten, Steven W., O48412.  
 Lothrop, James N., Jr., O26057.  
 Loughman, Jack P., O26282.  
 Loughran, Joseph P., O37167.  
 Lovell, Herbert R., O39253.  
 Lowe, Elward W., O54717.  
 Lowe, Horace A., Jr., O36857.  
 Lucas, John P., Jr., O26159.  
 Luck, William J., Jr., O36716.  
 Lundberg, George B., O25679.  
 Lundelius, Maurice W., O54864.  
 Lundy, Irvin M., O41000.  
 Lutz, Edwin M., O36755.  
 Lutz, George A., O37296.  
 Lutz, William D., O26018.  
 Lytle, James R., O48021.  
 MacArthur, John E., O40885.  
 MacDonald, Augustine G., O36989.  
 MacFarlane, William G., O36948.  
 Magathan, Wallace C., Jr., O25861.  
 Maguire, Robert F., O37528.  
 Mahan, James J., Jr., O48988.  
 Mallory, Barton J., O25764.  
 Malone, William F., O26044.  
 Marks, Sidney M., O36977.  
 Marrero, John, O54297.  
 Martak, Clyde J., O54719.  
 Martin, L. D. Kirkwood, O37177.  
 Martin, Lawrence E., Jr., O47622.  
 Marts, Harry H., O37186.  
 Masenga, Robert C., O54101.  
 Mathe, Robert E., O25878.  
 Mattox, Robert H., Jr., O26316.  
 May, Marion H., O25576.  
 Mazzucchi, Reno A., O36208.  
 McArtor, William S., O47849.  
 McBane, Robert B., O48890.  
 McBride, Robert B., 3d, O37277.  
 McCabe, Edward F., O25926.  
 McCabe, John T., O37126.  
 McCall, Ray N., O37381.  
 McCanna, Robert L., O26047.  
 McCarthy, Max R., O36249.  
 McCauley, Robert H., O36756.  
 McClain, Ralph E., O36661.  
 McCoy, Richard L., O36950.  
 McCoy, Robert G., O41003.  
 McCrory, Raymond J., Jr., O37146.  
 McCutchen, Roy M., Jr., O54575.  
 McDermott, William J., Jr., O48180.  
 McDowell, Charles T., O37309.  
 McDowell, Robert B., O25980.  
 McElwee, Frank D., O25409.  
 McGee, Dale F., Jr., O26253.  
 McGinnis, Norris D., O37232.  
 McGowan, John D., O25759.  
 McGuigan, William J., O36993.

McGurk, Donald J., O48078.  
 McKenzie, William H., 3d, O25929.  
 McKinney, Hugh L., O36986.  
 McLaughlin, Charles M., Jr., O37128.  
 McLendon, George P., O37133.  
 McLeod, Charles A., O27047.  
 McLeod, William E., O36374.  
 McMahan, Jack E., O37300.  
 McManus, Vincent J., O36334.  
 McMillan, William C., O54971.  
 McNary, Quentin L., O37212.  
 Mehrtens, Donald J., O25877.  
 Merrick, Thomas L., O37132.  
 Metts, Albert C., Jr., O26091.  
 Meyer, Richard H., O25872.  
 Michaelson, Franklyn J., O48532.  
 Milburn, Earl B., O48727.  
 Milley, William M., Jr., O37077.  
 Miller, James C., Jr., O25961.  
 Miller, Millard J., O47804.  
 Miller, Robert E., O54264.  
 Miller, Robert E., O37356.  
 Millhouse, Felix G., O36609.  
 Milligan, Jack A., O54586.  
 Milliken, William S., O41017.  
 Milmore, Charles W., O26045.  
 Milton, Ronald A., O54957.  
 Minckler, Rex D., O25581.  
 Mitchell, Arthur F., O36489.  
 Mitchell, John R., O25665.  
 Mitchell, Joseph W., Jr., O36351.  
 Mitchell, Joseph A., O48753.  
 Mitro, Michael P., O54862.  
 Moe, George R., O26022.  
 Moneyhun, Joseph A., O48065.  
 Moore, Clayton H., Jr., O48625.  
 Moore, Howard E., O25816.  
 Moore, Robert D., O36329.  
 Moore, Robert F., O36304.  
 Moore, Roy, Jr., O37063.  
 Moore, Thomas N., O37295.  
 Morgan, Henry G., Jr., O26305.  
 Morley, Harry C., O37341.  
 Morris, John W., O25992.  
 Moses, James R., O41035.  
 Moses, John G., Jr., O25528.  
 Moses, John W., O26170.  
 Mozingo, Roule C., O26274.  
 Mulheron, William, Jr., O47283.  
 Mulligan, Tracy E., Jr., O54309.  
 Murray, Charles P., Jr., O41057.  
 Murray, Edward H., O25730.  
 Murray, Paul, Jr., O36982.  
 Myers, Frederick W., O54959.  
 Myers, William R., O25513.  
 Nash, James H., O26153.  
 Neafus, Holady C., Jr., O54544.  
 Neale, William D., O25755.  
 Nechev, Walter F., O47231.  
 Neill, Harold A., O26271.  
 Nelson, Carlton, O47373.  
 Nelson, Oliver W., O37084.  
 Nethery, Donald M., O54988.  
 Nett, Joseph E., O25804.  
 Nett, Robert B., O41070.  
 Newberry, Robert H., O39232.  
 Newman, George E., O26015.  
 Nichols, George W., O54033.  
 Nixon, Victor M., O47617.  
 Nobles, Lloyd E., O36865.  
 Nolte, Marvin C. O., O36763.  
 Norris, John J., O25713.  
 Null, Jack G., O36202.  
 Nygard, Walter E., O25669.  
 O'Connor, Joseph F., O36411.  
 O'Connor, William S., O54316.  
 O'Donnell, James J., O47982.  
 O'Halloran, John T., O55106.  
 Oppenheimer, John S., O36490.  
 Orphan, Richard C., O26039.  
 Orsi, Francis J., O36238.  
 O'Sullivan, Michael N., O37162.  
 Ott, Edward S., Jr., O25860.  
 Page, Cecil W., Jr., O25723.  
 Pardue, Wallace D., O36413.  
 Parfitt, Harold R., O25914.  
 Parham, Douglas F., O26226.  
 Parker, Lester L., O36638.  
 Parker, Nicholson, O26193.  
 Pasta, Melvin J., O36713.  
 Patterson, James A., O36549.



Paul, Richard I., O36814.  
 Pavick, Pete D., O25699.  
 Pavy, Laurent A., O26088.  
 Payne, Otho C., O54764.  
 Peak, William O., 3d, O26025.  
 Peeples, Russell C., Jr., O36558.  
 Pehrson, Norman E., O25912.  
 Peixotto, James M., O47628.  
 Penuel, Victor B., Jr., O48015.  
 Perkins, Del S., O26016.  
 Perry, Benjamin E., O37328.  
 Peters, Emanuel P., O41006.  
 Peters, Kenneth A., O47220.  
 Peterson, Peter R., Jr., O47806.  
 Petrie, Glen E., O36827.  
 Peyer, Gustave A., Jr., O37207.  
 Pezdirtz, Joseph W., O36779.  
 Phillips, Henry G., O36383.  
 Phillips, James W., O26236.  
 Phillips, Steve F., Jr., O36624.  
 Pigg, Milton K., O26004.  
 Pinnell, Samuel W., O25880.  
 Plett, Robert E., O25924.  
 Plichta, Frank, O40884.  
 Plunkett, Hubbard T., Jr., O36991.  
 Powell, Donald F., O2762.  
 Prather, Herb D., O36258.  
 Prince, Altus E., O25714.  
 Pritchett, Harry H., Jr., O25705.  
 Proctor, Fred B., O25990.  
 Pruetz, George J., O37054.  
 Pruetz, Lloyd O., O39309.  
 Prugh, George S., Jr., O54092.  
 Puckett, Charles D., O26210.  
 Putnam, George D., O36328.  
 Quinn, Ray B., O36604.  
 Raaen, John C., Jr., O25486.  
 Rader, Robert J., O25676.  
 Ramsey, Thomas E., O25716.  
 Rasper, Arthur H., Jr., O26121.  
 Raub, Stanley C., O36209.  
 Raulin, Ernest C., Jr., O25793.  
 Ray, Roger, O26035.  
 Ray, William J., O26139.  
 Reberry, Gerald V., O37359.  
 Reed, Charles S., Jr., O25944.  
 Reeder, Harry L., Jr., O26214.  
 Rhea, Frank W., O25876.  
 Rhoads, Edwin M., O25956.  
 Riccio, Joseph A., O25737.  
 Richards, Robert H., O47545.  
 Richardson, Donald H., O37160.  
 Richardson, Howard B., O36934.  
 Richardson, James R., O25491.  
 Richardson, Warren L., O48271.  
 Riffe, James L., O54861.  
 Riles, William L., O36221.  
 Roach, Harold K., O25626.  
 Robinson, Reaford L., O36774.  
 Rockwood, Charles A., O37293.  
 Roe, Walter L., O26344.  
 Rogers, Bernard W., O25867.  
 Rogers, Charles I., O36778.  
 Rogers, Warren, O25913.  
 Romanek, Henry, O25911.  
 Romstedt, Gerhart O., O55056.  
 Rooker, Robert L., O26155.  
 Roop, William B., O54199.  
 Roos, William F., O25982.  
 Roquemore, Frank U., Jr., O36712.  
 Ross, James T., Jr., O36931.  
 Ross, John R., Jr., O25688.  
 Ross, Raymond H., O36412.  
 Rothbard, Leonard, O54051.  
 Rounsaville, Tom J., O36259.  
 Rowan, John V., Jr., O47374.  
 Rudziak, Nicholas D., O47988.  
 Rumpf, Edward J., O26180.  
 Runte, Walter G., O36525.  
 Rush, Roger S., O47718.  
 Russell, Cecil R., O36600.  
 Russell, John T., Jr., O25721.  
 Russell, Roger L., Jr., O24689.  
 Ruyffelaere, Raymond F., O25814.  
 Sadler, Robert E., O36522.  
 Saine, Harold J., O26291.  
 St. John, Adrian, 2d, O25583.  
 Salter, Max D., O37037.  
 Sanders, Roy A., O25612.  
 Sanders, Vernon K., O25476.  
 Sandlin, William B., Jr., O36406.  
 Sargent, Frank H., O48462.  
 Sawyer, Kenneth T., O25957.  
 Schatz, John P., O26224.  
 Schnebl, George A., O36639.  
 Schnelker, Gerald C., O36785.  
 Schoos, Robert B., O37375.  
 Schott, John L., Jr., O40901.  
 Schraeder, Gordon A., O25896.  
 Schroeder, Henry J., Jr., O26028.  
 Schumacher, Thomas C., O54290.  
 Schwalje, John M., O36430.  
 Scott, James M., O37201.  
 Scott, Russell F., Jr., O26325.  
 Scott, Samuel B., Jr., O36312.  
 Seabrook, George W., 3d, O48225.  
 Seaman, Harold D., O36616.  
 Sebesta, Arthur J., O25644.  
 Seibel, Paul, O36861.  
 Sembach, Leon, O26007.  
 Sexton, William E., O48110.  
 Shadle, William J., Jr., O37262.  
 Shanahan, James G., O36322.  
 Sharkey, Neil J., O37299.  
 Sharp, Hunter L., O36523.  
 Sharp, Sam H., O54968.  
 Sharra, George F., O36891.  
 Shaw, Charles R., O47789.  
 Shaw, Franklin P., Jr., O25492.  
 Shenk, Frank L., O37193.  
 Sheviak, Frank G., O40878.  
 Shields, Harry H., Jr., O54994.  
 Shipstead, Alton M., O26345.  
 Shoemaker, John O., O54351.  
 Short, David S., O36603.  
 Short, James H., O26242.  
 Shortall, John L., Jr., O25544.  
 Shultz, John J., Jr., O25550.  
 Sickler, Robert L., O37231.  
 Sieber, Harry F., Jr., O54161.  
 Smiley, Robert F., O48683.  
 Smith, Chester M., O40993.  
 Smith, Dale L., O54616.  
 Smith, Daugherty M., O25717.  
 Smith, Ellsworth W., O48540.  
 Smith, Frank B., O25888.  
 Smith, Gordon L., O26029.  
 Smith, Horrell H., O36562.  
 Smith, James F., O37046.  
 Smith, Orvil T., O37353.  
 Smith, Vincent P., O36499.  
 Soler, Eduardo, M., O26020.  
 Sonstelle, Robert D., O26141.  
 Spahr, William J., O26177.  
 Spalding, Basil D., Jr., O26341.  
 Spann, Frederick C., O25561.  
 Spiece, Donald C., O25989.  
 Spiegelberg, Frank J., O54373.  
 Spiker, Robert C., O35972.  
 Spratt, James L., O39233.  
 Sprigg, William H., O36318.  
 Stabler, Joseph P., O25647.  
 Stanford, Leslie E., O54587.  
 Stanley, Felix W., O36428.  
 Starr, Norman B., O36922.  
 Staszak, Stanley M., O25960.  
 Steinbach, Alois L., O48109.  
 Steinbring, Milton E., O25946.  
 Stevens, Milton E., O25471.  
 Stevens, Wilmer B., O37079.  
 Stiles, Robert B., O27000.  
 Stockton, John B., O26152.  
 Stoeckert, George I., O36757.  
 Stone, Lloyd E., O37138.  
 Stone, Stephen G., Jr., O47960.  
 Stowbridge, Robert W., O36501.  
 Strantz, William R., O54512.  
 Stroede, Roger A., O49045.  
 Strong, LeRoy, O48417.  
 Sullivan, Alden P., O41069.  
 Sullivan, Leo J., O37027.  
 Summerall, Robert E., O39314.  
 Sumner, Robert S., O36867.  
 Surkamp, Arthur T., O25935.  
 Surum, Henry, O36478.  
 Synnott, Donald A., O48542.  
 Taber, Eugene D., O47959.  
 Talbot, Max V., Jr., O26322.  
 Tallerday, Jack, O36346.  
 Tansey, Hubert E., O26031.  
 Tauber, Bernard L., O36715.  
 Taylor, Cloyd V., O47850.  
 Taylor, Dale W., O36935.  
 Taylor, Noble E., O40924.  
 Taylor, Richard I., O36676.  
 Taylor, Warren L., O26068.  
 Teague, Jack, O26354.  
 Tenney, Duane P., O26000.  
 Therrell, John W., O40899.  
 Thomas, George, O37081.  
 Thomas, Jesse R., O36320.  
 Thomas, Lorres C., O25930.  
 Thompson, Howard M., O47399.  
 Thomsen, Frank L., O54615.  
 Thomson, Arlington C., Jr., O54322.  
 Tillery, George G., O39267.  
 Tilson, Forrest B., O47769.  
 Tomlinson, William H., O26333.  
 Torgersen, Maxwell S., O37083.  
 Townsend, Delbert L., O41062.  
 Townsend, Robert T., O48913.  
 Truex, Ralph J., O25558.  
 Tucker, William O., Jr., O48880.  
 Tufts, Henry H., O54270.  
 Turrou, Edward A., O48222.  
 Umlauf, Louis B., Jr., O26338.  
 Underwood, Vernon W., O36204.  
 VanAuken, Wendell G., Jr., O26269.  
 Van Laethem, George, O36342.  
 VanSchoick, Arthur W., Jr., O26017.  
 Vaughn, Clarke S., O48868.  
 Veach, Fletcher R., Jr., O26301.  
 Venzke, Edgar L., O40979.  
 Vigen, Oscar C., O48256.  
 Vincent, Donato N., O36674.  
 Vognild, Alden E., O37080.  
 Vogt, Blaine O., O54699.  
 Volk, Karl W., Jr., O54596.  
 Vordermark, Jonathan S., O25917.  
 Voso, Edward J., O54117.  
 Wade, Arthur P., O25666.  
 Wald, Lewis C., O54314.  
 Walbridge, John H., O54767.  
 Waldie, James R., O36347.  
 Walker, Charles S., O48299.  
 Walker, J. LeRoy, O37248.  
 Walker, Mansell A., O54889.  
 Walker, William J., O36551.  
 Wallschleger, William L., O48250.  
 Walrath, Charles F., O36207.  
 Wardell, Patrick G., O25628.  
 Washcoe, Wilfred C., O36554.  
 Waters, Fred B., Jr., O25449.  
 Waters, James H., O37327.  
 Waters, William E., O25719.  
 Watson, George H., O25740.  
 Watson, Thomas R., O25718.  
 Watts, James H., O36348.  
 Webb, Hugh W., O47228.  
 Webb, Travis E., O36509.  
 Wechsler, Ben L., O54528.  
 Weems, Miner L., O40999.  
 Wehrle, Howard F., 3d, O25454.  
 Weller, Irwin Van A., O36764.  
 Wells, Jack D., O48257.  
 Wells, John A., O36205.  
 Wells, Sidney L., O36810.  
 Welsh, William J., Jr., O26339.  
 Wessmiller, John J., Jr., O54052.  
 Wesson, Thomas E., O37280.  
 Westbrook, Robert L., O37049.  
 Westfall, Clarence R., O26024.  
 Westmoreland, Raymond M., O36607.  
 Weyrick, Joseph W., O26294.  
 Wheeler, John P., Jr., O25824.  
 White, Arthur B., O54886.  
 White, John F., O25507.  
 White, Lee A., O41061.  
 Whitfield, Harold N., O41032.  
 Whitworth, Mancel R., O36563.  
 Wickert, Howard T., O26312.  
 Wiggins, Edward G., O36457.  
 Wikan, Walter W., O36512.  
 Wiley, Harlon R., O37082.  
 Wilhelm, Leland F., O48723.  
 Wilhelm, John F., Jr., O37233.  
 Wilke, Robert G., O47408.  
 Wilkinson, Reading, Jr., O26257.  
 Willcox, Edwin J., O25594.  
 Williams, Harry O., O37184.  
 Williams, James E., O48104.  
 Williams, Louis A., O36161.  
 Williams, Norman L., O26173.

Williams, Paul R., O36707.  
 Williams, Richard W., Jr., O47344.  
 Willig, Lester G., O47419.  
 Willis, Jean P., O37283.  
 Wilson, Charles A., Jr., O25907.  
 Wilson, Gerald R., O36338.  
 Wilson, John M., O25556.  
 Wilson, Roy R., O25827.  
 Wilson, William M., O47616.  
 Wimert, Paul M., Jr., O48914.  
 Windsor, Thomas B., O25670.  
 Winfield, Richard M., Jr., O26117.  
 Winiarczyk, Andrew W., O47278.  
 Wolf, Karl E., O26202.  
 Wolfson, Morton, O48975.  
 Womer, Richard E., O36623.  
 Wood, Franklin, O26104.  
 Wood, John S., Jr., O25655.  
 Wright, David B., O54276.  
 Wright, Elam W., Jr., O37214.  
 Wright, Lucius F., Jr., O25966.  
 Wright, Raymond J., O36780.  
 Wuest, Charles H., O39280.  
 Yoder, Quentin E., O48994.  
 Young, Crawford, O25984.  
 Young, Curtis F., O37305.  
 Young, George H., Jr., O36242.  
 Young, James R., O37365.  
 Young, Maurice L., O36794.  
 Young, Ralph E., O26331.  
 Younger, Douglas G., O36945.  
 Yount, Harold W., O54875.  
 Zellefrow, Albert E., O40982.  
 Zuckerbrot, Irving, O36901.

*To be majors, Chaplains*

Hutchins, Gordon, Jr., O31291.  
*To be majors, Women's Army Corps*  
 Bouton, Irma V., L195.  
 Brister, Jane G., L289.  
 Grant, Patricia E., L181.  
 Gray, Dorothy, L159.  
 Holsington, Elizabeth P., L164.  
 Martin, Ethel M., L182.  
 Mashidlausky, Agnes A., L171.  
 Metzger, Hope, L174.  
 Price, Lenore M., L177.  
 Robinson, Delia D., L278.  
 Root, Barbara E., L162.  
 Trulock, Sue B., L188.  
 Yonick, Frances M., L157.

*To be majors, Medical Corps*

Allerton, William S., O59713.  
 Anderson, Clarence LeR., O61069.  
 Archer, Francis C., O66607.  
 Arnett, Norman L., O62928.  
 Arrington, Clifton W., O58032.  
 Austin, James A., O65571.  
 Badgley, Theodore McB., O62975.  
 Beck, Marcus R., O60043.  
 Beckwith, Richard R., O62953.  
 Beisel, William R., O59560.  
 Bellas, Joseph J., Jr., O65675.  
 Berke, Irving, O62918.  
 Berrey, Bedford H., O65949.  
 Biehuse, Frederick C., O58038.  
 Bindeman, William W., O58713.  
 Bitner, Leland M., O59570.  
 Blemly, Nelson, R., O62969.  
 Bolliger, Eugene F., O59717.  
 Bottiglieri, Nicholas G., O67791.  
 Boysen, Alexander M., O59612.  
 Brackebusch, Carl O., O59561.  
 Briggs, Gordon W., O62940.  
 Briske, John P., O62931.  
 Brittis, Anthony L., O60042.  
 Brody, Arnold J., O58099.  
 Brosius, Otto C., O59645.  
 Brune, Warren H., O66613.  
 Buchanan, David P., O59563.  
 Buescher, Edward L., O60050.  
 Butterworth, Charles E., Jr., O59617.  
 Canham, John E., O62925.  
 Canney, Philip C., O65573.  
 Carlton, Donald C., O67903.  
 Carstensen, Harold G., O60061.  
 Carter, Willis H., O58097.  
 Cavin, Elwyn, O62917.  
 Cenac, Mark T., O63220.  
 Champlin, Gerald A., O60046.  
 Chandler, Bruce F., O59613.  
 Chandler, Eugene F., O63672.  
 Chase, Robert A., O59719.  
 Child, Proctor L., O67905.  
 Cole, Norman J., O58028.  
 Collins, Warren J., O59564.  
 Conroy, Joseph V., Jr., O59707.  
 Conroy, William J., O59614.  
 Cook, Edgar L., O63167.  
 Crepps, William F., O59629.  
 Crow, John B., O59623.  
 Curtis, Hugh P., O58048.  
 Daniel, Crowell T., Jr., O59693.  
 Daniels, Roswell G., O60058.  
 Davis, Albert J., Jr., O59556.  
 Dillon, Robert F., O62943.  
 Downs, Charles R., O62970.  
 Draheim, John H., O60034.  
 Fisher, George W., O67569.  
 Forrester, Ralph H., O63165.  
 Froemming, William E., O64930.  
 Gaffney, John J., O65998.  
 Gamble, Robert D., O59694.  
 Garner, Robert C., O58733.  
 Garrett, Richard H., O62945.  
 Gibbs, James J., O62934.  
 Gibson, John R., O63454.  
 Gilpatrick, Cleston W., O59649.  
 Glew, Donald H., Jr., O59550.  
 Glock, Robert F., O62936.  
 Gonder, Maurice J., O62948.  
 Goplerud, Clifford P., O59700.  
 Gordon, John N., O59695.  
 Graybill, Leon D., O59567.  
 Green, Richard E., O62935.  
 Gregory, Lloyd J., Jr., O58100.  
 Griffin, Herschel E., O65676.  
 Hackett, Louis J., Jr., O66622.  
 Hall, Robert J., O59628.  
 Hall, Robert McC., O64929.  
 Hall, William H., O60133.  
 Hamilton, George B., O60143.  
 Hammill, James F., O59543.  
 Hannon, Joseph L., O59553.  
 Hansen, Herman R., O67926.  
 Hansen, James E., O62926.  
 Harman, Louis E., Jr., O62916.  
 Harrison, Ira B., O59603.  
 Hausman, William, O58273.  
 Hawe, Donald W., O70194.  
 Hedberg, Charles L., O59566.  
 Hood, Robert F., O62949.  
 Howie, Donald L., O60756.  
 Hoyt, Jay C., O59445.  
 Hume, Vincent H. S., O62921.  
 Hurd, Harry F., O59587.  
 Innes, Robert C., O68016.  
 Irvin, Robert W., Jr., O59555.  
 Isham, William H., O59610.  
 Jackson, Lawrence M., Jr., O59443.  
 Jahnke, Edward J., Jr., O59591.  
 Jeans, Park C., Jr., O59600.  
 Jeffords, Francis W., O57910.  
 Jensen, Robert T., O60761.  
 Jessemann, Winston C., O60060.  
 Johnson, Arnold W., Jr., O62920.  
 Johnson, David E., O63164.  
 Jones, Robert C., O62941.  
 Kelm, Robert R., Jr., O62937.  
 Kelly, Thomas D., O65420.  
 Kempe, Ludwig G., O67586.  
 King, Robert J., O62973.  
 King, Samuel V., O65421.  
 Latteri, Joseph A., O61949.  
 Lauderdale, James M., O59552.  
 Lawson, John D., O65533.  
 Leddy, Donald V., O63721.  
 Leslie, William T., O69524.  
 Lienhard, Wendell F., Jr., O62933.  
 Lincoln, Arthur P., O60033.  
 Lindig, Edwin, Jr., O58776.  
 Lineback, Carl M., O66037.  
 Livingstone, Bruce L., O62944.  
 Lynch, Charles L., O67911.  
 Lyon, Donald R., O59634.  
 Mason, Roscoe E., O59618.  
 Masters, Joseph H., O62968.  
 McFaddin, James G., O65418.  
 McGonagle, Laurence C., O62938.  
 McGuire, John M., O65575.  
 Meriwether, William A., O65572.  
 Meyerderks, John J., O58039.

Moncrief, John A., O59697.  
 Moore, Charles A., O59584.  
 Moore, Walter H., Jr., O67597.  
 Moser, Robert H., O59597.  
 Munger, Richard S., O67599.  
 Murphree, Harold C., O68389.  
 Nelson, Thomas G., O64933.  
 Newman, Stanley, O62965.  
 Nicholas, Theodore H., O58771.  
 O'Dell, Edward T., O79960.  
 Owens, Kenneth N., O59586.  
 Painter, John H., O59551.  
 Palmer, Paul W., O60097.  
 Farmer, Robert E., O62960.  
 Passmore, Jack W., O60144.  
 Peisel, Francis J., O59621.  
 Phelps, Harvey W., O64935.  
 Phippen, William G., O59581.  
 Piper, Clinton A., O64934.  
 Pitts, Forrest W., O59747.  
 Pixley, Charles C., O57841.  
 Porter, Warren E., O58046.  
 Price, Douglas B., O62930.  
 Quinn, Robert H., O67605.  
 Reisner, John E., O62952.  
 Richert, Joel H., O60145.  
 Rigney, Francis J., O62923.  
 Rink, Richard A., O64927.  
 Rosenberger, Eugene A., O62951.  
 Roth, Joel L., O60139.  
 Rubini, Milton E., O62974.  
 Ruth, Charles J., O59646.  
 Schillhammer, William R., Jr., O63453.  
 Schmidt, Robert B., O62966.  
 Schwab, Gerald J., O62961.  
 Serfas, Lee S., O61184.  
 Sharp, John H., O59619.  
 Sherman, Jacques L., Jr., O59541.  
 Sherman, Robert L., O60062.  
 Sherwood, Robert W., O63476.  
 Sholk, Alvin, O59630.  
 Simenson, Robert A., O58101.  
 Singer, Ralph C., O66638.  
 Skeehan, Raymond A., Jr., O67959.  
 Smith, Dermott A. P., O65532.  
 Smith, Vernon M., O62964.  
 Stallones, Reuel A., O62929.  
 Steinborg, Robert J., O59635.  
 Stowens, Daniel, O65570.  
 Stutzman, Leon, O58266.  
 Terrill, Arthur A., O59594.  
 Teschan, Paul E., O59604.  
 Throne, Elias M., O62956.  
 Tiffany, William J., Jr., O65417.  
 Tomsovic, Edward J., O58217.  
 Tormey, David M., O59609.  
 Van Avery, Jasper L., Jr., O59703.  
 Vander Ploeg, Darl E., O62963.  
 Walsh, Richard A., O61187.  
 Ward, Richard A., O60070.  
 Wells, Charles H., O70126.  
 Westfall, Charles H. P., O62971.  
 White, David C., O60763.  
 Wikler, Irving, O67883.  
 Williams, Fred C., O57906.  
 Winn, Dean F., Jr., O57959.  
 Woodward, George S., Jr., O62924.  
 Woodward, Kent T., O58230.  
 Wright, William H., O59580.  
 Yourish, Norman B., O59764.

*To be majors, Dental Corps*

Bolbat, Walter J., O60735.  
 DiMatteo, Albert J., O60099.  
 Konze, Charlie F., O59448.  
 Rau, Martin H., O59447.  
 Rowan, Robert J., O61063.  
 Schreiber, Leonard K., O60734.  
 Stiesmeyer, Edward H., O60741.  
 Watkins, John A., Jr., O56259.

*To be majors, Veterinary Corps*

Chadwick, Ralph D., O31280.  
 Falling, Frank W., O31288.  
 Gleiser, Chester A., O31289.  
 Klett, Wilbert M., O52047.  
 Vacura, Gordon W., O31309.

*To be majors, Medical Service Corps*

Adams, Edward S., O56230.  
 Bates, Elvis E., O37577.  
 Blakeslee, Theodore E., O56970.  
 Brown, Charles T., O37506.



Burleson, Derwood E., O37586.  
 Chitwood, Douglas C., O56248.  
 Clark, Jack K., O37524.  
 Crosby, Leonard A., Jr., O49967.  
 DeVine, Joseph R., O37520.  
 DuMond, Paul A., O37607.  
 Evans, Robert D., O37568.  
 Fink, James L., O37604.  
 Gottry, Samuel M., O37544.  
 Graber, Charles D., O37555.  
 Graham, Harold E., O37531.  
 Gwin, Jack W., O37598.  
 Hazelriggs, James A., O39345.  
 Holloman, Chester C., O41159.  
 Holt, John H., O37814.  
 Hoover, Thomas H., O37565.  
 Hrdlicka, Otto G., O37512.  
 Hughes, Robert L., Jr., O37591.  
 Julian, Russell E., O37590.  
 Kadrovach, Dan G., O37613.  
 Keating, Edward J., O37611.  
 Kerwin, Bernard F., O37567.  
 Kilmer, Joseph M., O37498.  
 Kistler, Grover C., O49958.  
 Klodniski, Stanley F., O56946.  
 Knickerbocker, Max E., O41151.  
 Knoblock, Edward C., O41158.  
 Kropp, Arthur J., O37561.  
 Lapiana, Joseph A., O56952.  
 Leary, John J., O56235.  
 Luehrs, William C., O37521.  
 Mathis, John E., O56251.  
 Munson, Jack W., O39349.  
 Newbold, William M., O37538.  
 Nichols, Maurice W., O37532.  
 Normington, Joseph M., O41157.  
 Parker, Elliott G., O37540.  
 Peters, George M., O37533.  
 Piercy, Clarence H., Jr., O37603.  
 Reich, Norman, O37516.  
 Rivas, Ernest G., O37543.  
 Ryan, Francis J., O56957.  
 Scarpitta, Anthony, O37519.  
 Schmahmann, Lionel H., O37583.  
 Shedivetz, Clayton L., O37514.  
 Shepler, Lloyd B., O37445.  
 Smiley, Frank H., O37582.  
 Smith, Charles R., O37608.  
 Smith, Robert L., O39350.  
 Specht, Murval F., O37558.  
 Spika, Howard J., O37593.  
 Stacey, Richard M., O41153.  
 Stock, William E., Jr., O37595.  
 Strobel, Edward M., O37584.  
 Thompson, Elmer L., O37513.  
 Torgerson, Fernando G., O37523.  
 Valentine, Robert G., O37585.  
 Walsh, Glen M., O41156.  
 Waters, John F., 2d, O37605.  
 Wells, Floyd B., O37575.  
 Whitaker, Harry T., O37539.  
 White, William F., O37597.  
 Williams, Alonzo R., O41140.  
 Wisser, Nathan R., O37522.  
 Wood, Norman E., Jr., O37596.  
 Wrigley, John H., O41161.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps*

Blochberger, Irene C., N145.  
 Breitung, Elizabeth L., N1902.  
 Claussen, Esther, N2217.  
 Clifford, Louise M., N2114.  
 Cuppy, Mary K., N141.  
 Fitzgerald, Eileen, N575.  
 Hanna, Elizabeth T., N2026.  
 Harper, Margaret, N147.  
 Houston, Eva D., N1950.  
 Lessley, Georgia E., N1869.  
 Mettie, Elizabeth E., N156.  
 Pollard, Bertha E., N566.  
 Reeve, Agatha M., N120.  
 Sar, Cecelia M., N1876.  
 Schaupp, Miriam C., N144.  
 Shutt, Edith L., N112.  
 Snowden, Hazel I., N1895.  
 Tobin, Nora M., N1872.

*To be majors, Army Nurse Corps*

Barrett, Ruth, N1884.  
 Benninger, Marion L., N1885.  
 Crain, Joy B., N1954.  
 Cullen, Mary B., N2367.  
 Eddins, Grace T., N2373.  
 Garrard, Delzena E., N1890.  
 Goodman, Thelma B., N1957.  
 Holland, Alice E., N2048.  
 Houston, Emma F., N1960.  
 Jennings, Catherine T., N2125.  
 Jensen, Wanda, N2123.  
 Kornfeld, Helen A., N105.  
 Lassiter, Janie L., N2041.  
 Mallette, Bernadette M. J., N1893.  
 Miller, Alberta J., N2132.  
 Oswald, Marie A., N2047.  
 Peck, Loucelle E., N2049.  
 Ross, Margaret C., N2129.  
 Steadman, Winnie, N1961.  
 Uftring, Celestia H., N2042.  
 Zirkle, Winifred R., N2370.

*To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Andersland, Louise S., J61.  
 Boger, Martha M., M10062.  
 Buck, Kathryn V., R10130.  
 Davies, Elizabeth J., M10102.  
 Ehlers, Christine D., M10036.  
 Hobson, Edith M., R10042.  
 Ladd, Margaret P., M10115.  
 Lydon, Josephine C., R10123.  
 Marshall, Eleanor M., M10040.  
 Strain, Ruth G., R10070.  
 Summers, Evelyn G., R10122.  
 Swartz, Dorothy L., R10008.  
 Tremback, Helen, R10073.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

*To be captain*

Ivan, Gabriel A., O25865.

*To be first lieutenants*

Coy, Malcolm L., O70313.  
 Horton, Dan H., O69951.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 625, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress:

*To be captain*

Wakefield, Walter W., DC, O1186763.

*To be first lieutenants*

Baze, Wallace R., DC, O985332.  
 Bond, William R., Jr., DC, O2274489.  
 Canfield, Margaret E., ANC, N900487.  
 Capper, Robert S., MC, O1941999.  
 Chapin, Viola M., ANC, N799606.  
 Dolinski, Eleanor, ANC, N805636.  
 DuVal, Charles H., DC, O4055774.  
 Edmonson, George B., MSC, O4007125.  
 Edwards, Ian K., MC, O2267482.  
 Fisk, Mary L., AMSC, R2657.  
 Kishpaugh, Barbara F., ANC, N794839.  
 Mahoney, Bettijane, ANC, N901384.  
 Monahan, James L., DC, O938692.  
 Morgan, Betty F., ANC, N804710.  
 Murphy, Michael J., MC.  
 Rita, Mary, ANC, N773684.  
 Stearns, Barbara J., AMSC, M20004.  
 Taft, Hunter G., Jr., MSC, O957540.

*To be second lieutenant*

Giffin, Joan L., WAC, L1010768.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Beard, Hallard W.  
 Butler, Donald E., O1321150.

Creveling, Robert L.  
 Cummins, Leo H.  
 Dalbey, Charles G., O2275604.  
 Duncan, Theodore G. W.  
 Johannessen, John M., O2275423.  
 Kriebel, Richard H., O2275416.  
 Kwedar, Edward W.  
 Lazarus, Herbert R.  
 Mueller, Robert L.  
 Schultz, Thomas L., O2275457.  
 Scioscia, Eugene A.  
 St. Louis, Joseph A., Jr., O2275402.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Andrew, Dale H., O2211141.  
 Bird, William C., O2275905.  
 Fuller, Walter W., O2277419.  
 Karr, James H., O2276574.  
 Poprik, Michael, Jr., O2276966.  
 Prince, Jack P., O2275893.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Barnette, Bobby L.  
 Ficks, Filmore L., O4003776.  
 Gerasimon, Gerald G.  
 Luthultz, Gene H., O4030922.  
 McCool, James M., O4010589.  
 Olchovik, Stanley, O4010670.  
 Taylor, Richard F., O4031018.  
 Werner, Stanley A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Barnes, Frederick N.  
 Bradby, Harold N., Jr.  
 Corbett, Richard L., O4053035.  
 Coruthers, John M., Jr.  
 Denny, Davis M., Jr.  
 Donner, William O., Jr.  
 Fitzekam, Gordon L.  
 Hensley, William R., O4036566.  
 Johnson, Marion, Jr., O4048936.  
 Lamont, William, Jr.  
 Lanier, Jack D.  
 McPheeters, Leander B., Jr.  
 Metcalf, Jack A., O4048958.  
 Pistorius, Joseph H., Jr.  
 Plough, Ronald C.  
 Spinelli, Michael A., O4059373.  
 Terry, Robert L.  
 Thompson, Jackson D.  
 Walker, William C.  
 Worrell, Armond J.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1956, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Dacus, Lester H.  
 German, Norton I.  
 Muzzio, Robert J.  
 Pyles, Thomas E.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1956, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Abbott, Jerry M.  
 Aceto, Vincent R.  
 Adams, George B.  
 Adams, Jack L.  
 Adkins, John E.  
 Agnew, Jack S.  
 Aicken, Larry B.  
 Aldrich, David F.  
 Alexander, William E.  
 Allman, John W., Jr.  
 Amoneno, Ernest G.  
 Amos, Julian E.

- Andersen, William A.  
Anderson, Douglas F.  
Anderson, Valjean C.  
Angelo, Joseph S.  
Archer, James H.  
Arlotti, Mario G.  
Armfield, Samuel L.,  
III  
Arnecke, Charles O., Jr.  
Arnim, Cecil H., Jr.  
Arnold, John M.  
Ashworth, Don C.  
Atkinson, Don R.  
Axtell, Ralph R.  
Baker, A. J.  
Balboni, Louis A.  
Balcerzak, Marion J.  
Bales, Garry L.  
Bannister, Edwin J.  
Barber, Robert G.  
Barker, Harold S., Jr.  
Baxter, Arthur S., Jr.  
Beavens, Arthur M.  
Beck, Edmund S.  
Bedard, Ronald L.  
Bedford, Robert E.  
Bell, Lawrence A.  
Bell, Ronald K.  
Bender, Robert  
Bennett, James D.  
Berkley, John L.  
Berman, Myron B.  
Bird, Max R.  
Birdsong, Edward M.,  
Jr.  
Birkenholz, Richard M.  
Blagg, Thomas E.  
Blair, David A.  
Blair, Jerral D.  
Blaker, William J.  
Blanton, Albert B., Jr.  
Blecharczyk, Stephen S.  
Boerner, Dennis H.  
Bolani, Peter J.  
Boldon, David L.  
Boles, Bennie C.  
Bonner, Benjamin J.,  
III  
Bonnett, William B.  
Borland, Paul C., Jr.  
Botts, Robert H.  
Bourne, William G.  
Boyd, James W., II  
Braddock, David R.  
Braithwaite, Garlan D.  
Bramlett, Mead R.  
Brashears, Bobby F.  
Briggs, Joel L.  
Britt, Henry M.  
Bromley, Barton W.,  
Jr.  
Bronson, Russell A.  
Brookhart, Edgar W.  
Brooks, Thomas W.  
Brown, Charles H.  
Brown, Roy A.  
Broyles, Alvin K., Jr.  
Bryant, James W.  
Brylla, Charles W.  
Buccola, Victor A.  
Buchanan, James R.  
Burg, James H.  
Burgess, Robert B., Jr.  
Burns, Edwin A.  
Bursat, Miguel A.  
Buswell, Arthur T.  
Byrd, Hale H.  
Byrne, Robert J.  
Calderwood, Earl H.  
Calhoun, Creighton L.,  
Jr.  
Calvert, Jack F.  
Campbell, Donald A.  
Camper, Kenyon L.  
Cann, Donald C.  
Carlsen, Gary H.  
Carrasquillo, Humberto R.  
Carter, Donald D.  
Carter, Robert H., Jr.  
Carter, Thomas E.  
Carter, Woodward C.,  
II  
Charles, George H., Jr.  
Chesley, Arthur P.  
Codd, Nicholas J., Jr.  
Coffee, Edwin F., Jr.  
Coffman, Ronald L.  
Cogswell, Richard J.  
Coleman, Willis H.  
Colson, John T.  
Concilio, Richard V.  
Cook, Richard A.  
Cosimini, Gino N.  
Cover, John P.  
Cox, Randall S.  
Craver, Douglas M.  
Crawford, Cecil M.  
Crewse, Leonard L.  
Croft, John A.  
Crosby, James C.  
Crowe, James L.  
Crowe, John M., Jr.  
Cruft, Ronald A.  
Cunningham, Clarence  
Custard, Norman L.  
Dal Corobbo, Bruno V.  
Danahy, Franklyn T.  
Daniell, Joseph A., Jr.  
Dann, Herbert I., Jr.  
Daugherty, John M.,  
Jr.  
deCamp, William S.  
DeLorme, Wayne F.  
Dei Vecchio, John, Jr.  
Demetropoulos, Andrew J.  
Dempsey, John M. L.  
DeThorne, Raymond J.  
Detjens, John, III  
Dinsmore, Wiley  
Ditman, William D.  
DiValentino, Leo E.  
Dixon, Robert C.  
Doke, Marshall J., Jr.  
Donaldson, Thomas W.  
Dove, Hoy D., Jr.  
Dow, Richard A.  
Dowling, Donald J.  
Doyle, Charles T.  
Draper, Ronald F.  
Dross, David D.  
Drury, Dan L.  
Dubin, Leonard  
DuBose, Perryman F.  
DuBrule, Paul A., Jr.  
Dudley, Gerald O.  
Dunn, James E.  
Dvorak, Philip J.,  
O4017546  
Eagle, John R.  
Eastwood, Clifford A.,  
Jr.  
Eaton, Melville L.  
Eckles, Spencer F.  
Eckert, William N.  
Edsall, Richard H.  
Edwards, Eugene T.  
Ellis, Don C.  
Enloe, James A.  
Ethridge, Wayne H.  
Evans, Bobi R.  
Evans, Gary B.  
Farley, Andrew N.  
Fee, Gordon G.  
Fennell, George R., Jr.  
Filler, Merl C., Jr.  
Finkelout, Robert E.  
Finley, Jerry D.  
Fisher, Anthony B.  
Fisher, Robert L.  
Fitzmorris, Lawrence B.  
Florence, David L.  
Floyd, Jerry M.  
Foard, John B., III  
Ford, Wilbur E., Jr.  
Fraleigh, Harold J.  
Frazier, James H.  
Freeman, Charles G.  
Freisem, Robert D.  
Galligan, Robert A.  
Garrett, Doyle B.  
Garrett, Richard E.  
Garside, Robert E.  
Georges, Peter J.  
Gibb, Robert B.  
Gibbons, James H.  
Giles, George E.  
Gillie, Gerald R.  
Gillmore, Joseph R.  
Gilpatrick, Volney T.,  
Jr.  
Givhan, Walter H.  
Glasker, Samuel J.  
Glover, Richard R.  
Goddard, Donald R.  
Gonzalez, Richard E.,  
Jr.  
Gooch, Robert G.  
Gordon, Harold J.  
Gordon, John V.  
Gordon, Kenneth F.  
Gothard, Donald L.  
Gowell, Earle R., Jr.  
Greene, Earl M.  
Griffith, Franklin D.  
Griminger, Charles O.  
Grinnell, Leroy A.  
Gross, Donald  
Gross, Thomas R.  
Groves, Billie R.  
Guilfoyle, Francis M.  
Habermann, Larry M.  
Harbuck, Edwin C.  
Hardin, James A.  
Harding, Trewitt D.  
Harmon, Marsden A.  
Harris, Bruce R.  
Harris, Kenneth A.  
Harwig, Donald H.  
Harwood, Michael S.  
Hatch, Vernon L.  
Haynes, Jesse L., Jr.  
Hearn, Jerry L.  
Heckman, Richard T.  
Heggen, Larry E.  
Hemminger, Girard L.  
Hersey, Frederic T.  
Hickerson, Arville L.  
Hilgeman, Charles E.,  
Jr.  
Hilton, Jimmie L.  
Hinkleman, Robert S.  
Hinspeter, William L.  
Hodges, Charles E.  
Hodges, Harold E.  
Hoffman, Jack E.  
Hohmann, Jere W.  
Hokanson, Nils C. I.  
Holder, Bobby W.  
Holland, Harold B.  
Hollenbeck, Elmer W.  
Hollister, Myron P.  
Hood, William P., Jr.  
Hooker, Richard D.  
Hopkins, Woodard B.,  
Jr.  
Hopp, Keith R.  
Horn, Will H.  
Horrigan, Lawrence B.,  
Jr.  
Horton, Floyd W.  
Houlis, Harry S.  
Houston, Joseph B.,  
Jr.  
Howerton, William B.  
Hudson, Alfred H.  
Hudspeth, Thomas J.  
Huff, Donald W.  
Humphrey, Jerry H.  
Hunt, Byron W.  
Hunt, J. Howard  
Hutson, Leonard E.  
Hutton, John D.  
Immschweiler, David R.  
Ingram, Duane C.  
Ippolito, Charles P.  
Irvin, Charles L.  
Israel, Glenn A.  
Jackson, George F.,  
Jr.  
Jakuc, Henry S.  
James, William N.  
Jarvis, Richard C.  
Jefferson, Walter, Jr.  
Jenkinson, Harlan H.  
Jensen, Lynn R.  
Jessup, William R.  
Jetta, Norman W.  
Johnson, William J.  
Jones, Carleton H., Jr.  
Jones, Teddy R.  
Jordan, Arthur B., III  
Jovan, George A.  
Judd, Roger C.  
Kalbaugh, Gary A.  
Karlin, Philip J.  
Katz, Charles M.  
Kaufman, Richard C.  
Keliher, John G.  
Kelly, James O.  
Kelly, Thomas A.  
Kennedy, Irvin D.  
Keppeler, John P., II  
Kernan, Redmond F.,  
III  
Kilpe, Gunars  
Kilmington, John E.  
Kinder, Norman W.  
King, John R.  
Kirkmire, Nicholas J.  
Kitchen, Kenneth S.  
Kite, John C.  
Klein, Rudolph F., III  
Knapper, Aubrey L.  
Kohlhoff, Karl F.  
Kramer, Bryce R.  
Kraus, John H.  
Kripowicz, John P., Jr.  
Krome, Alan  
Kronenberger, Lawrence  
Kronmiller, Lowell K.,  
Jr.  
Kuluz, Peter J.  
Lackey, Lyman A., Jr.  
Ladd, John P.  
Lafayette, William P.  
Lake, Howard K., Jr.  
Landry, Bernard A.  
Lane, Robert L.  
Lang, George P.  
Lattner, George J.  
Laughon, Richard W.  
Law, Laurence J.  
Lawhorn, Douglas A.  
Lawrenson, Bruce E.  
Leckinger, Paul A.  
Lecocke, Frank J.  
Lee, Ray H.  
Lehner, William J., Jr.  
Leonard, Ronald K.  
Leonak, John J.  
Lester, Robert J.  
Lindanger, Earl L.  
Lingaitis, Francis V.  
Littlejohn, Thomas W.  
Lockridge, Robert W.,  
Jr.  
Lockwood, Willard E.  
Logan, Rodney W.  
Losik, Robert C.  
Lowe, Jack W.  
Lowe, Thomas L., Jr.  
Lundberg, Ronald J.  
Lunn, John G.  
Lunsford, Earl M.  
Lyons, Calvin G.  
Maass, Charles G.  
Maguire, James E.  
Malsbury, James S.  
Manhart, Richard A.  
Mann, Robert L.  
Mapes, Steven E.  
Maphis, Samuel W.  
Margaruccio, Robert G.  
Marinelli, Gino A.  
Marquis, Donald A.  
Marsh, Elgin R., Jr.  
Marshall, John P.  
Martin, Samuel  
Marx, Thomas J.  
Mason, John  
Mason, Richard O., Jr.  
Massey, Oran A.  
Matthews, Kenneth F.,  
Jr.  
McCain, Arthur W., Jr.  
McCarthy, John J.  
McCarty, Douglas W.  
McClain, Robert C.  
McClain, Terrence W.  
McCoy, Charles E., Jr.  
McCreedy, David J.  
McCreery, John L.  
McCullough, James A.  
McCurry, Spencer L.,  
Jr.  
McDowell, Robert C.  
McFadden, James D.  
McGinley, Frank L.  
McGowan, Paul A.  
McGraw, Van C.  
McGregor, Donald V.  
McKee, William S.  
McKinney, Collin J.,  
Jr.  
McKinney, Horatio W.  
McKown, Richard J.  
McLaughlin, Charles H.  
McLaughlin, James J.  
McLeod, David S.  
McMillan, Robert B.  
McSpadden, Gilbert R.,  
Jr.  
Merchant, Frederic L.,  
Jr.  
Meyer, Allan E.  
Meyers, Stewart E., Jr.  
Mikuta, Joel J.  
Milliron, Joseph F.  
Mills, Lawrence L.  
Mitcham, William G.  
Mock, Thomas D.  
Monahan, Edward J.  
Morehead, Robert N.  
Morey, William S.  
Morris, Joseph L.  
Mosure, Thomas F.  
Mouring, Barron W.  
Moxley, William M., Jr.  
Munro, Robert D.  
Murphy, Clifton M.  
Murphy, George S., Jr.  
Nelson, Marlin G.  
Netterblad, John W.  
Nichols, William B.  
Nicholson, Donald E.  
Nicol, Carl R.  
Nobriga, Gordon H.  
Nock, Carleton C.  
Norbo, Gary J.  
Novotny, Richard A.  
Nowick, Henry W.  
O'Brien, Robert M.  
O'Bryant, James E.  
Oeck, Emil A.  
O'Keefe, Timothy J.,  
Jr., O4051990  
Onley, John H.  
O'Rourke, Lewis C.  
O'Rourke, Peter J., Jr.  
Osa, Nelson  
O'Shaughnessy, Thomas E., Jr.  
Owens, John H.  
Padden, Edmund J.,  
Jr.  
Padgett, David H., Jr.  
Painter, Charles F.  
Pape, Richard J.  
Parham, Byron A. P.  
Parks, Donald  
Parsons, Walter H., III  
Patton, Edwin P., Jr.  
Pearson, John R.  
Pearson, Stanley R.  
Pellegrinon, Ronald G.  
Perryman, James D.,  
Jr.  
Perryman, William E.  
Phillips, William F., Jr.  
Pitman, Kenneth M.  
Pitre, George L., Jr.  
Polhemus, Richard E.  
Pothin, Paul F.  
Powell, Richard E.  
Powers, Max L.  
Pugmire, Robert M.,  
Jr.  
Raines, Fred B.  
Rainey, Ellis C., Jr.  
Ramey, Hubert D.  
Ranger, David W.  
Raudebaugh, James D.  
Ray, Robert L.  
Reason, Robert L.  
Reed, Donald L.  
Reedy, Henry J.  
Reeves, Stanley J.  
Reicker, Frederick A.  
Rein, Richard H.  
Rhoads, David E.  
Rhodes, Chester J.  
Rhone, Jimmy S.  
Riggs, Joseph A., Jr.  
Rivera-Sola, Fernando  
Roberts, Charles W.  
Robinson, Thonius, Jr.  
Rod, Ronald F.  
Roddy, Robert E.  
Rogers, Richard S., Jr.  
Romanski, James F.  
Rose, Jerald L.  
Rose, Walter N.  
Ross, Charles A.  
Roughley, David  
Roush, William W.  
Roy, Charles D.  
Rubin, Franklin D.  
Rush, Karl C.  
Rusk, Edward E.  
Russell, James F.  
Ryan, Edmund M.  
Sanches, Manuel L.  
Santiesteban, Humberto T.  
Santoro, David A.  
Sawey, William J.  
Schaubhut, Norman J.  
Schessler, Donald R.  
Schlee, Gerald J.  
Schmidt, John L.  
Schneider, Robert S.  
Schofield, David G.  
Schoonmaker, Paul D.  
Schober, Frank J., Jr.  
Schuber, James D.  
Schwab, Bernard A.,  
III  
Sechrest, Noah S., Jr.  
Seiser, William R.  
Seich, Glenn C.  
Senko, John M.  
Sherry, Thomas A.  
Sherrill, Ernest K.  
Sherrill, Lawrence W.,  
Jr.  
Shoemaker, James P.  
Shore, Lawrence B.  
Short, Earl D., Jr.  
Shuck, David L.  
Shumate, John W.  
Shumway, Dean L.  
Sides, Jerry M.  
Sigler, Jackson L., Jr.  
Sikkenga, Donald P.  
Simon, Frederic P.  
Simpson, Charles E.,  
Jr.  
Sims, Paul D.  
Sinagra, Robert L.  
Sitkin, Charles P.  
Skoronski, Frank M.  
Smedley, Jimmy G.  
Smith, Raymond G.  
Smith, Raymond W.  
Smith, William F.  
Snowden, Edgar, IV  
Snyder, Harold B., Jr.  
Snyder, Ronald E.  
Snyder, William H., III  
Speth, Gerald L.  
Squires, Myron E.  
Staiger, Charles W.  
Stark, Robert L.  
Stern, Allan R.



Stevens, Philip J.  
 Stevenson, Frederick N., Jr.  
 Stewart, Charles F., Jr.  
 Stewart, James A.  
 Stiles, Ronald E.  
 Stillions, Eugene L., Jr.  
 St. Jacques, Ernest O.  
 Stokes, Theodore K.  
 Stokes, William M., III  
 Stone, Frank R., Jr.  
 Stork, Richard C.  
 Storms, Peter F.  
 Storrs, Norman B.  
 Stotser, George R.  
 Streisand, Sheldon J.  
 Stringer, Paul G.  
 Strohmayer, Alfred R.  
 Strong, Daniel M.  
 Stuart, James R.  
 Stuart, John C., Jr.  
 Sturgeon, James M.  
 Sultenfuss, Gerard E.  
 Swann, John H.  
 Swenson, Arthur G.  
 Swift, John B.  
 Swoboda, Edward J.  
 Tapp, Richard L.  
 Tarby, Stephen K.  
 Tatum, James M.  
 Taurke, Erwin A.  
 Taylor, Henry S., III  
 Taylor, Perry R., Jr.  
 Taylor, Richard C.  
 Taylor, William H.  
 Thacker, Goebel R.  
 Theroux, Gilbert L.  
 Thompson, Ronald A.  
 Tieken, Richard V.  
 Tippet, Laurence A.  
 Todd, Ronald D.  
 Tompkins, Raymond E.  
 Toner, Richard B.  
 Torres, Marco, Jr.  
 Townsend, Merton L.  
 Treece, Ausby J.  
 Tripp, Joseph W.  
 Trounday, Roger S.  
 Turk, Roy M.  
 Turley, James R.

Tyler, Warren C.  
 Vanbeber, Herman J.  
 Van Cleave, Henry D., Jr.  
 Van Poucke, Marcel L., Jr.  
 Vetterling, John M.  
 Victory, Antony M.  
 Von Urff, Charles A.  
 Wahl, Don D.  
 Wakefield, Donald Y.  
 Walker, George J.  
 Walker, Jimmy F.  
 Walker, Peter H.  
 Walls, William H.  
 Warlick, Joseph R., Jr.  
 Watke, Frederic W.  
 Watts, Ronald L.  
 Weber, Wayne G.  
 Weinlauf, Donald E.  
 Werning, John B.  
 Wheatley, Robert R., III  
 White, Jack A.  
 Whitmer, Henry J.  
 Wiersema, Kenneth E.  
 Wilber, Donald E., O4058431  
 Wiljanen, Walter A.  
 Wilkerson, Arlie J.  
 Williams, Donald G.  
 Williams, Richard L.  
 Williford, Donald E.  
 Wilson, Robert W.  
 Wittekind, Wilfred H.  
 Wojtal, Robert J.  
 Wojtas, Jerry R.  
 Wolfe, Robert A.  
 Wolfe, William M.  
 Woodie, Kenneth J.  
 Woodmansee, Wayne E.  
 Woods, Robert D.  
 Yoho, Robert O.  
 Young, Charles D.  
 Young, Daniel K., Jr.  
 Zabransky, Ronald  
 Zanuck, Richard D.  
 Zekans, Henry A.  
 Zickel, Raymond E., Jr.  
 Zoubandis, James

### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, April 18 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the source of the true, the splendor of the beautiful, and the strength of the good, we are again coming unto Thee through the old and familiar way of prayer, compelled by our needs and constrained by Thy love.

Grant that we may have a faith that is humble and courageous as we seek to minister and mediate unto all mankind the blessings of peace and prosperity.

Inspire us to give ourselves earnestly and eagerly to the leading of Thy spirit and may we make a more daring trial of the moral and spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

Fill us daily with a fervent desire and a strong determination to build a social order in which justice and righteousness, good will and brotherhood shall reign supremely.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 21st day of January 1957, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. MARTIN.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 26]

Ashley	Haley	Morgan
Boykin	Healey	O'Hara, Minn.
Dawson, Ill.	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Donovan	Holtzman	Powell
Eberharter	Hosmer	Scherer
Engle	Jackson	Tollefson
Gamble	Johnson, Calif.	Velde
Gary	Kilday	Williams, N. Y.
Green, Pa.	Mollohan	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit in executive session during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill H. R. 12, an act to provide an improved farm program.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if it is possible for me to say anything about H. R. 12 which has not already been said, but I do feel justified in making some observations about this very controversial measure. I introduced H. R. 12 on January 5, 1955. Our committee conducted long hearings. Our committee room was open to all who wanted to be heard. The bill was reported to the House with nonpartisan or bipartisan support and, after a very long and hard fight, the bill passed this House and was sent on to the Senate. There it remained until the beginning of this year.

Members of Congress are being criticized, and very severely criticized, because of what is called a great delay in the passage of farm legislation. I do not think I need to defend the House Committee on Agriculture nor need I defend the membership of this House. I need only to put the facts in the Record, and the facts are that our committee and this House early last year recognized the seriousness of the farm situation and sought to do something about it. Yes, some of us are being accused of playing politics. I think all the Members of this House know me well enough to know, and they certainly know my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] well enough to know, that neither one of us has ever at any time been willing to play politics with the problems of the farmers of America. Partisan politics has been kept out of the deliberations of our committee. I repeat here that in the 22 years I have served on the committee, we have had only one partisan vote, and that was in the spring of 1949.

This conference report does not represent only the labors and views of members of my party. I said here the other day and I repeat that I do not know how it would be possible for 10 devoted Members of Congress to work more diligently and more faithfully on a piece of legislation than did the House and Senate conferees on H. R. 12. This conference report is not the handiwork of Democrats. It was not signed only by members of my party. Of the 4 very distinguished statesmen of the Republican Party who sat day in and day out and way into the night, through the Easter holiday, 3 of the 4 signed this report. That should be convincing evidence to everyone that there is no partisan politics involved in this measure. Why should anyone be so absurd as to suggest that any of us are prompted by partisan politics? I have believed through the years and I still believe that the problems of agriculture are paramount to all other problems, even to the problems of peace; because until we can solve the paradox of plenty here in this Nation of ours and hunger in other lands, we cannot hope to live in a very peaceful world.

I have seen this week some great demonstrations of really true, sturdy statesmanship on this floor. I have seen men who have heretofore entertained views that they did not express here until last

Wednesday. They were prompted by the purest emotions and impulses in the hearts of statesmen. And I am talking about Republican statesmen, who had the nerve, the honesty, and the integrity to come into the well of the House and say, "I have studied this problem, I have talked with my farmers at home, and I and I alone have been authorized to represent them in the House of Representatives"—one after the other. Can you tell me that men like the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and his colleagues, are not good Republicans? They are good Republicans if there are any on this earth. Can you tell me that Mr. BELCHER, our beloved colleague, who has labored long and hard on our committee, is playing politics because he voted for this measure which he knows provides the only hope to help the farmers of America in their present plight and predicament?

I could go on and name many Republicans who supported this bill not because of partisan politics but because they believed in it. I indulge the hope that they believe in it now.

Unfortunately, and I think it is unfortunate, I believe that the great man in the White House has been too well protected and insulated. I honestly do not believe that he has been well advised concerning the provisions of this bill. A reading of his veto message would indicate that he actually does not even now understand the provisions of this bill.

What does the bill do? What did all of us want to do? All of us wanted to do something to help the farmers of America. This veto will take out of the pockets of farmers more than \$3 billion that we were trying to put into their pockets.

The soil-bank provision does not increase farm income. It only replaces farm income. But one thing it definitely does, it definitely decreases farm purchasing power to exactly the same extent that the soil-bank fund is used.

I say that to appeal to the men from the industrial area. That soil bank will cut off \$1,200,000,000 of the purchasing power of the farmer and he will buy that much less fertilizer, insecticides, farm machinery, and other things that are needed on the farm. So why should we bring here a bill restricted only to the soil bank? The price-support provisions of this bill would put into the farmer's pocket approximately \$1,300,000,000, yes, income and purchasing power, and would not increase the surplus we now have in storage.

I hate to complain about the President's message. He says that this bill is full of contradictions. The fact is his message is full of inconsistencies. He seems to lose sight of the fact that before the producers of basic commodities are eligible to receive the 90-percent price support provided in the bill they must of necessity comply with the orders of Mr. Ezra Benson himself and reduce their acreage in keeping with his mandate. It is not a subsidy, it is not a hand-out.

Here we are, knowing as we sit here that farm income is going down and down and down, and that the impact is being felt in every industrial center in

this country. Yes, in the country stores and out on the highways and the byways, you can see what has happened. We are inevitably going into another depression unless we can do something to check and change this tragic downward trend in farm income and purchasing power.

Now—what are we supposed to do about it? I voted here the other day, honestly believing as I do today, that this is a good bill. I frankly admitted that it was somewhat of a legislative monstrosity when it came out of the other body and was referred to conference. But, we took the bill apart. We carved it to pieces section by section and word by word and we rewrote the bill in conference. We presented it here to the House with bipartisan support. The President complains about surplus disposal. By vetoing this bill, he prevented the enactment of 14 provisions which would have strengthened his arm in disposing of these surplus commodities or preventing their accumulation. We sought to give him \$500 million additional for section 32 operations and the power to pay the ocean freight to send surplus commodities to hungry people wherever they are in the world.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time to read but will insert for the RECORD a more detailed analysis of the President's veto message and the effects of his veto.

#### COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

First. The nine-point program referred to by the President in his message consisted largely of generalities and the blocking out of areas of the agricultural problem for study by Congress. No specific legislation was sent up to implement the program and it was not until February 28 that the Committee on Agriculture received specific legislative proposals embodying the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. The legislation was not then submitted voluntarily but was made available only after a direct committee request on the Secretary for such a bill.

Second. It is difficult to understand how H. R. 12 would encourage more surpluses than the program endorsed by the President. No change is made or proposed in the basic legislation under which production is now regulated and will continue to be regulated whether H. R. 12 becomes law or not. The basic tools for adjusting production to demand and preventing surpluses are the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended. These would be fully as operative under the provisions of H. R. 12 as they will be under any other type of program. In fact, they would be more effective at a higher level of support because it has been clearly demonstrated that there is greater compliance with marketing quotas and acreage allotments at high support levels than at lower levels.

Even more important, however, is the fact that by vetoing H. R. 12, the President has deprived the Secretary of Agriculture of at least 14 new provisions of law to assist in dealing with the surplus problem—provisions providing authority

which the Secretary does not now have and which he will not be able to exercise in the absence of new legislation. Following is a list of the new authority to prevent surpluses or to help dispose of them contained in H. R. 12 as approved by the House and Senate:

(a) Corn: In order to be eligible for price supports, corn producers would be required to reduce their acreage of crop-producing land by 15 percent.

(b) Feed grains: H. R. 12 offers, for the first time, some solution to the rapidly deteriorating feed-grain situation that is hurting not only grain producers but livestock producers as well. Under the provisions of H. R. 12 feed-grain producers would be eligible for price supports only if they curtailed their acreage of feed grains at least 15 percent below their previous 3-year average. Under the Secretary's program feed-grain producers receive supports on all the grain they want to produce, without any limitation whatever on their acreage.

(c) To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in the bill to process food commodities, such as grains, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the States and the Federal Government to donate food commodities to certain penal institutions.

(d) To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and the amount which can be used under title II of Public Law 480 is increased from \$300 million to \$500 million.

(e) The domestic parity plan for wheat would solve a number of the problems relating to overproduction and surpluses of that commodity. It would encourage the producers voluntarily to limit their production to a quantity more properly adjusted to current needs. It would put world trade in American wheat on a sound economic basis for the first time in many years by making it possible to offer that wheat for sale on the world market, at the world price, without Government subsidy.

(f) Use of wheat as feed on the farm where grown would be facilitated by the wheat program in H. R. 12 by permitting any farmer, anywhere to grow all the wheat he wants to grow, without penalty, for use on his own farm for feed or food.

(g) Rice: The rice two-price plan would substantially improve the position of United States rice in the world market. Like the wheat program in the bill, it would make possible the sale of United States rice on the world market, at world prices, without any Government subsidy whatever.

(h) H. R. 12 would attack the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by placing extra long staple cotton within the quota now set up for all cotton longer than 1½ inches.

(i) Solution of our surplus problem, particularly in textiles, would be substantially assisted by new authority given the President in H. R. 12 to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of



competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

(j) H. R. 12 authorizes appropriation of an additional \$500 million annually to section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities.

(k) The bill authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

(l) H. R. 12 authorizes and directs the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

(m) To make more effective our present production control laws, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

(n) In order to further encourage the underplanting of acreage allotments, the bill authorizes a producer, for the first time, to plant only part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This would eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem—authority which the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have—there were other directives in the bill designed also to substantially improve the surplus situation. The Secretary of Agriculture was directed to make a study of proposals for disposing of surplus food commodities domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan. He was directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter. He was directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency. He was directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long staple cotton specifically.

Third. The soil bank would not increase farm income—this year or any other. Because farmers would receive at the most only their anticipated net income from acres placed in the acreage reserve, their gross income would be substantially curtailed by participation in the soil bank. This would be reflected in sales of fertilizer, farm machinery, gasoline, and other supplies to farmers.

Fourth. The President refers to the problem created by the diversion into other crops of acreage removed from basic-commodity production by allotment programs. He has vetoed the bill which sought to do something about this serious problem by authorizing a program for feed grains and a more effective program for corn, but he has made no suggestion as to what he now proposes to do about this problem.

Fifth. The President says production would be stimulated by the support levels provided in H. R. 12. With the control programs in effect on all basic crops, it is difficult to follow his reasoning at this point. Production of the basic crops is regulated by acreage allot-

ments—not by price levels. In this connection I must reiterate that H. R. 12 offers, for the first time, a program for actually reducing the production of feed grains—which is rapidly becoming one of our serious agricultural problems. In the absence of H. R. 12 there is no such program for feed grains and production will run rampant and uncontrolled.

Sixth. The President devotes four paragraphs to a condemnation of dual parity and says that its establishment in H. R. 12 could "destroy the parity concept itself". Strangely enough, dual parity has been in effect since enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949 without destroying the parity concept. Modernized parity was recognized when it was adopted as inequitable to the basic commodities and requiring such a sharp drop in support prices as to be economically impossible. Dual parity was, therefore, provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 and has been in operation every year since then except 1955.

Seventh. In condemning the provisions for feed grains in H. R. 12, the President says that these provisions would result in a shrinking market for feed grains—presumably because these grains would be supported at a somewhat higher price. It is difficult to follow the President's reasoning in this respect since the statistics of the Department of Agriculture show exactly the contrary—that consumption of feed grains is at least as high and usually higher, when the price is higher. The reason for this is that the price of livestock is closely related to the price of feed and when livestock prices follow feed prices upward, livestock producers are more prosperous and can afford to buy more and better feed.

The following figures show the relationship I am talking about: In 1951 feed grains were 25 percent higher than they were in 1955, yet Department of Agriculture records show that livestock producers fed slightly more feed per animal unit in 1951 than they did in 1955. The same principle is exemplified in 1953. Then, feed grains were about 13 percent higher than 1955, yet consumption of feed was substantially above that estimated for 1955.

The price of livestock in those years also showed the relationship between feed grains and livestock. In 1951, with feed prices 25 percent above last year, hogs brought an average price for the year of \$20 and beef cattle brought an average price of \$28.70. Compare this with the livestock prices in 1955 with lower feed grain prices—the level of prices which the Secretary of Agriculture apparently finds desirable. In 1955—on an unweighted basis—hogs brought an average of \$15.50, and cattle only \$15.80.

Admittedly there is very little in H. R. 12 of direct benefit to livestock producers, but the vetoing of H. R. 12 and the carrying out of the kind of a program outlined by the President in his message will be one of the most serious blows the livestock industry has suffered for a long time. Every livestock producer knows that when feed prices are low and feed is in surplus livestock is plentiful and prices are cheap. With their heavy

capital investment, it is far better for livestock producers to pay a reasonably high price for their feed with the assurance that they will receive a correspondingly higher price for their animals. The feed grain program espoused by the President, of low level supports on unlimited production, is the worst possible news the livestock industry could hear. By increasing the support level on feed grains and at the same time requiring a 15 percent reduction in acreage, H. R. 12 would go a long way toward solving not only the feed grain problem but the financial difficulties of livestock producers.

Eighth. After devoting four paragraphs to the evils of dual parity, the President dismissed, in less than three lines of his message, the programs for rice and wheat which would put both those commodities on a sound world price basis and which have been worked out most carefully by the producers of those commodities after years of study. The rice industry has formally and almost unanimously requested the kind of program provided in H. R. 12. An important segment of the wheat industry has requested the wheat program and all wheat producers would have an opportunity to vote on it with a two-thirds majority required to put it into effect. Yet, the President says that neither rice growers nor the wheat farmers are to have this opportunity they have asked for.

Ninth. The President finds "certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry" objectionable, but he has approved supports for manufacturing milk and butterfat at precisely the levels estimated by H. R. 12. Apparently it makes a substantial difference whether prices are established by act of Congress or by action of the executive branch of the Government.

Tenth. The price level announced by the President for wheat is only 3 cents per bushel above the March 15 price and amounts to about 83.7 percent of parity.

Eleventh. The price level announced for corn is about 30 cents above the March 15 price and equivalent to about 86.2 percent of parity.

Twelfth. The price level announced for rice is only 4 cents above the March 15 price and equivalent to about 82.7 percent of parity.

Thirteenth. A separate support program for corn "not under acreage control" to be announced at an early date would hardly seem to be the kind of action to substantially discourage production of corn or greatly reduce the surplus problem. By contrast H. R. 12 has a realistic program for corn outside the commercial area.

There is too much good in the bill for the President to have vetoed it. But, he did veto it. I am not going to be too optimistic about overriding his veto. I know that he was exercising his constitutional rights and responsibilities. He had a perfect right to do what he did. Every Member of the House of Representatives has a perfect right to do what he did last Wednesday and we have the perfect right today to exercise freely our own judgment. But, it would seem to me, it would be very, very difficult for

a man who represents farmers or consumers or the industrial centers to go back home and say, "I voted against the bill that would intensify and would increase the purchasing power of agriculture so that the farmers of the Nation could purchase the things that industry produces."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the administration make any major farm legislation recommendations last year?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad my friend mentions that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, will the gentleman give the history of the soil bank and what the attitude of the administration was last year.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I will. I appreciate the suggestion.

Before this Congress adjourned last session, I asked the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates if they had any more recommendations to make, and if any more legislation was needed. The answer was "No," but the farm situation continued to deteriorate.

Mr. Benson returned from Europe. The newspaper reporters met him at the airport and he gave out a statement to the effect, "Yes, we have some programs we are working on and the details will soon be around." Later, he flew out to Denver, and after a conference with the President, he came back. Again, he was met by the newsmen and he said, "Yes, we have a program." On October 31, I wired him and called attention to the fact that the House of Representatives by an appropriate resolution had authorized me to call our committee together at any time and at any place, and I was ready, willing, and anxious to call the committee together to receive such recommendations as he might desire to make. I told him then that time was important. We could have worked through October and November, but we received no recommendations.

When he replied to my telegram he said that the recommendations of the administration would come up in traditional fashion and would be presented to the Congress in January. January 9 arrived. The President sent up his agricultural message, but we received no executive communication from Mr. Benson transmitting a bill for our committee to consider. So we waited.

The Senate had started hearings. We did our work last session. We had other hearings this session. But when the President's message came with a nine-point program, there was not a new thought or a new suggestion in any of the 9 points. All of them had been considered many times by Members of Congress and by the appropriate committees of Congress.

When Mr. Benson, when he was freed from his appearances before the Senate committee, we asked him to come before our committee, and—after some delay—he appeared on February 21. But, even then, he had no bill. I said "Mr. Secretary, where is your bill?" He looked at his associates there with him, and they had no bill.

In the meantime two bills had been introduced. Neither of them contained his recommendations in full. So I asked him, "Will you please bring to this committee next Monday, the 27th, a bill embracing all of the recommendations you have to make?"

So late on the 27th of February—7 weeks to the day after the President's message—the Secretary finally sent up a bill. On the 28th of February I wrote him a letter, after having conferred with the 37-man Agriculture Committee, and extended an invitation to him to come before our committee to discuss his bill. His reply was to the effect that because of his heavy schedule it would be impossible for him to appear before our committee for 2 weeks.

Two weeks we waited. What else could we do? We had heard the testimony of all the farm leaders and all the farmers and all of the other people who wanted to be heard. So finally, at the end of the third week, almost 3 weeks later, I wrote him another letter, and he then indicated that he was ready to come before the committee, but at that very moment the bill was ready to go to conference. Then I was faced with the proposition, should I delay the conference in order to hear Mr. Benson or should we proceed with the conference and let him submit his recommendations in writing. I decided to do the latter.

I want to comment on this conference; I have been in many conferences but I have never attended any conference like this. We extended to Mr. Benson and all of his associates an opportunity to give us the full benefit of their views and their technical advice and assistance in drafting as good a bill as we could draft. We did not have a single meeting that was not attended by officials of the Department of Agriculture. We had from 7 to 9 people there—the legal branch and the administrative branch—and they participated in our discussion. If there ever has been an open conference that was it. After every meeting the public was fully advised about the progress that had been made. I do not like the idea of having Members of Congress blamed for delaying unduly this very important measure.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has not, I believe, discussed the history of this soil bank. Is it not a fact that a year ago this last February two bills were introduced in our committee, one by a Republican and one by a Democrat embracing a soil bank very similar to that the President now supports? That you as chairman of our committee asked the Secretary for suggestions in regard to those bills, and in July of last year he said the bills were unworkable?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right; the gentleman is entirely correct. I do not believe the farmers of this country have any doubt about the origin of the plan. The original bills were introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] on the Republican side and FRED MARSHALL, another distinguished

Member of Congress, on the Democratic side.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I personally introduced this bill for a soil bank on February 2, 1954. A week prior to that Mr. Benson, as will be evidenced by our hearings, informed us that in his opinion the general principle was unworkable.

Mr. COOLEY. At the gentleman's request, I sent that bill, along with FRED MARSHALL's bill, to the Department for an official report. They kept the two bills from February until July 27, and on July 27, after a committee in the Department had studied the proposition, they wrote me a letter rejecting the bill, and said this:

The Department recommends against the enactment of this bill.

And the letter goes on with a long report telling me why the soil-bank bill could not be made to work.

But between July and January the soil-bank idea—which was born when Mr. ANDERSEN and Mr. MARSHALL introduced their bills—the soil-bank idea grew in popularity and became on January 9 the administration's farm program.

I said to begin with, and I want to repeat right now, that I believe the President now has all the authority he needs to deal with all of the problems of the soil of America. All he needs is money. I challenged the Department representatives in the committee room and I said:

Mr. Benson, tell me what authority you want and need that you do not now have.

He looked at his associates, and at his attorney, and we had no answer.

He has broad and comprehensive authority to deal with all the problems of the soil. I would like to read them to you but time will not permit me to do so, so I will insert in the RECORD at this point the relevant parts of sections 1, 7 (a) and 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended:

#### SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That it is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare and that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors, protect public health, public lands and relieve unemployment, and the Secretary of Agriculture, from now on, shall coordinate and direct all activities with relation to soil erosion and in order to effectuate this policy is hereby authorized, from time to time—

(1) To conduct surveys, investigations, and research relating to the character of soil erosion and the preventive measures needed, to publish the results of any such surveys, investigations, or research, to disseminate information concerning such methods, and to



conduct demonstrational projects in areas subject to erosion by wind or water;

(2) To carry out preventive measures, including, but not limited to, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, and changes in use of land;

(3) To cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act; and

(4) To acquire lands, or rights or interests therein, by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, whenever necessary for the purposes of this act. (16 U. S. C. 590a.)

#### AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION POLICY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PURPOSES

SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purposes of this act shall also include, (1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility; (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; (4) the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and (5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio. The powers conferred under sections 7 to 14 inclusive, of this act shall be used to assist voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes specified in this section. Such powers shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as determined by the Secretary from the records of domestic human consumption in the years 1920 to 1929, inclusive, taking into consideration increased population, quantities of any commodity that were forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports during such period, current trends in domestic consumption and exports of particular commodities, and the quantities of substitutes available for domestic consumption within any general class of food commodities.

#### BASIS FOR PAYMENTS AND GRANTS OF AID; LOCAL, COUNTY, AND STATE COMMITTEES; CONSERVATION MATERIALS AND SERVICES

(b) Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices

which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); or (5) any combination of the above. In arid or semiarid sections, (1) and (2) above shall be construed to cover water conservation and the beneficial use of water on individual farms, including measures to prevent runoff, the building of check dams and ponds, and providing facilities for applying water to the land. In determining the amount of any payment or grant measured by (1) or (2) the Secretary shall take into consideration the productivity of the land affected by the farming practices adopted during the year with respect to which such payment is made. In carrying out the provisions of this section in the continental United States, the Secretary is directed to utilize the services of local and State committees selected as hereinafter provided. The Secretary shall designate local administrative areas as units for administration of programs under this section. No such local area shall include more than one county or parts of different counties. \* \* \* The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of the respective committees, and to the administration, through such committees, of such programs. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary—shall, as far as practicable, protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers; is authorized to utilize the agricultural extension service and other approved agencies; shall accord such recognition and encouragement to producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations as will be in harmony with the policy toward cooperative associations set forth in existing acts of Congress and as will tend to promote efficient methods of marketing and distribution; shall not have power to acquire any land or any right or interest therein; shall, in every practicable manner, protect the interests of small producers; and shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil-depleting crops. Rules and regulations governing payments or grants under this subsection shall be as simple and direct as possible, and, wherever practicable, they shall be classified on two bases: (a) Soil-depleting crops and practices, (b) soil-building crops and practices.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making available conservation materials consisting of seeds, seed inoculants, fertilizers, liming and other soil-conditioning materials, trees, or plants, or in making available soil-conserving or soil-building services, to agricultural producers under this subsection, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or covering soil-conserving or soil-building services, furnished to producers, or who render services to the Secretary in delivering to producers approved conservation materials, for the carrying out, by the producers, of soil-building or soil-conserving practices approved by the Secretary. The price at which purchase orders for any conservation materials or services are filled may be limited to a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purchase in advance of the program year for which the appropriation is made of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in programs under this act; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or

other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)).

There is the broad authority. We have had a soil bank, I know, since 1934. In 1934 we spent \$637 million on a soil bank.

Under the authority of these provisions of law, the Department of Agriculture has carried out numerous programs of similar nature to the present soil-bank proposal. One of these was described by the Secretary to the House Agricultural Committee in the following words in March 1955:

Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program. These so-called class I or acreage allotment payments, under section 8 (b) of the act of February 29, 1936, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, were aimed at maintaining farm production in balance with demand. This was carried out by the establishment of individual farm acreage allotments of soil-depleting crops representing proportionate shares of national production goals. The acreage allotment payments compensated farmers, in part, for making their proportionate acreage adjustments. This item excludes the so-called class II payments for conservation practices which are shown on the statement under the function headed "Programs Primarily for Conservation of Resources." The cost of these acreage allotment payments, which were made in the period 1937 through 1944, amounted to \$2,354.8 million.

Year after year this Congress, with votes on both sides of the aisle, has given to Mr. Benson tens of millions of dollars more than he has asked us to give him. He asked for \$175 million for the ACP program and we gave him \$250 million. All of a sudden he comes up and he wants \$1,200,000,000. I am willing for him to have that. But I want the record to show that Congress has not only given Mr. Benson more money than he has requested for soil conservation programs but that he has not used all we did give him. In the past 4 years he has failed to use more than \$100 million of the funds Congress has appropriated for this important purpose.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that a few years ago he was here with the recommendation and making an effort to cut down the very program from \$250 million to \$150 million?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, the gentleman is correct; but the Congress refused to do that because we have appreciated the value of the soil program.

I remember when I first came to Congress the great speech made by that distinguished statesman, Mr. Fred Vinson, the beloved Kentuckian. He talked about the value of the topsoil of America. We have year after year spent millions of dollars and I am willing now for Mr. Benson to improve the soil, to have a soil bank, but I am not inclined to go into the committee room and to write a bill to duplicate authority he now has. He does not have authority to make 10-

year contracts. There may be a few minor things that we need to do. But the basic law is there and I challenge any lawyer in this House to read the law and tell me that my statement is inaccurate.

Let us face up to the situation. Perhaps I am not going to persuade anybody to change his mind. But let us think about our own responsibilities. The President has exercised his responsibility. Every Member of this House was elected from a great congressional district and each of us must share and bear our own responsibility. We are facing a tragic situation in the constant decline of farm income.

The President recognized that, the President said that, and I want to quote one thing and then I think I will stop. In his message to Congress on January 9, he made a statement, and these are very significant words because Mr. Benson has never used them but once and that was in the city of Paris. He never made a speech like this here. Here is what Mr. Eisenhower said:

Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperatively needed in wartime.

That we know to be the truth. Why are we so greatly disturbed that we have a surplus here which has been accumulated because of programs we had in operation at a time when the men of America were on the ramparts of freedom throughout this world and bleeding and dying in behalf of the institutions of freedom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Inasmuch as we are going to have an extended debate, I wonder if the gentleman is reserving any time for this side?

Mr. COOLEY. I conferred with the former chairman and ranking minority member of our committee and he indicated he would like to have some time. If the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to speak, of course, I shall yield him time.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] would like to have some time today.

Mr. COOLEY. I will be as generous as circumstances permit.

Mr. MARTIN. That is an old story. How much time is the gentleman going to give us?

Mr. COOLEY. How much time does the gentleman from Indiana want?

Mr. HALLECK. At least 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. We might take the other 20 minutes, too.

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot be that generous. I will give the gentleman 10 minutes and then see where we stand. I will yield him 10 minutes after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] speaks.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, certain questions have arisen in connection with this veto on which there seem to be con-

siderable misunderstanding. In the first place, I think there is a complete misunderstanding on the part of the President as well as on the part of others as to just how we affect the production of agricultural commodities by price. The President seems to indicate that all of our troubles from an agricultural standpoint have come from what he calls "high, rigid" price supports. I think the fallacy of the President's position is perfectly clear. He simply does not understand just how a farmer must operate. The President says "Why would a farmer plant more if he knew the price were going down?" I think that is a fair question, and I think it deserves a fair answer. Farmers are just like other people. They do the best they can for their loved ones, just as city people do. Suppose you were a cotton farmer or a wheat farmer. Last year the price of cotton was 31 cents a pound or \$160 a bale. Suppose you grew 10 bales of cotton. You would have a gross of \$1,600 from your farm. Suppose you learned in some manner that the price next year was going to be just half that or \$80 a bale. What would be your reaction? The President assumes that you would immediately cut your cotton production. Of course, he assumes you would go into something more profitable, and that would be fine except for two things. In the first place, the price of all crops is depressed. There is no profitable alternative you can go into. In the second place, as a cotton grower, you doubtless live in a one-crop area. So does the wheat grower, and so does the tobacco grower; so do all of those who grow these basic commodities. That is the reason we call them basic commodities, because they are basic to the community in which they are grown. The man who grows peanuts, although it does not amount to a great deal in the total of the Nation, is dependent upon that peanut crop, and to him peanuts are just as basic as the corn crop or the wheat crop or the cotton crop. So it is with the producers of all of these commodities. They are each basic where grown, and there is no opportunity for the farmer to turn to something else. His only recourse, to maintain the living standards of himself and family, is to grow more, not less, cotton or wheat. And, that is exactly what the farmers will do. It is what they have always done. We grew our largest cotton crop when we had a price support of 52 percent of parity.

According to General Eisenhower, we should have been importing cotton that year, but we grew over 19 million bales at 52 percent of parity. It is the failure to understand this simple economic fact which has caused so many of our people to be critical of 90 percent supports. It has been a misunderstanding that has caused so many people to make the mistake the President has made and to charge that the so-called high rigid supports have caused an accumulation of vast surpluses at a great loss to the Nation. Of course, 90 percent supports are not high and they are not rigid. They are only nine-tenths of a fair price. Would a labor union take nine-tenths of a fair wage? Would the Bell Telephone Co. accept a rate that returned only

nine-tenths of a fair return? These support prices are not rigid because they are tied to parity and parity itself goes up and down; up, only if the farmer's costs have increased and down any time the farmer's costs come down.

But let us look at the record; I shall quote to you from Secretary Benson's own record, his printed record of January 31, 1956. That shows that on that date our total losses on all 6 of the basic commodities were only \$522 million. This incidentally compares with a net profit on those 6 commodities of over \$13 million the day General Eisenhower took office. Up until that same day we had lost about \$120 million on milk and milk products in about 20 years. But as of last January our losses on milk and milk products alone stood at \$958 million and the support on milk and milk products has been flexible every day of that time.

That is not a loss on high, rigid supports. That is a billion-dollar loss on a flexible commodity, more than \$800 million of it occurring under President Eisenhower.

I want to take the few remaining moments that I have to call attention to what I think is an extremely important matter, in regard to the provision of this bill that the President vetoed. I refer to the control of production of feed grains. For the first time in history this Congress has given the country a bill that automatically provides for a reduction in the production of feed and feed grains. That bill, which he criticizes, has in it in plain language a provision—and it is the first time we have had it—that, in order to get supports, the growers of corn and of feed grains all over the United States must make a reduction in their production, and we offered to pay enough to encourage such a reduction.

Surely, corn has had acreage allotments for years, but never has it been subject to the marketing quotas imposed on cotton and wheat, and never has corn production been effectively controlled. In this bill we have said that if you are going to get 90 percent supports you have got to take a certain percentage of your land out and put it into the soil bank. We have said to the grain-sorghum man in Texas and in Kansas and in the Southwest area, if you are going to get the supports that we offer, you have got to reduce your acreage by 15 percent. But the President has vetoed that provision and comes back and proposes to pay those people a support price of 86 percent on corn with no effective control. He has also vetoed the requirement that the grower of feed grains must cut his acreage. He has reduced the income of the grain grower but he has, at the same time, greatly increased the flood of cheap feed which is about to drown us.

How are you going to save the great livestock industry? You cannot do it by simply going out and knocking calves in the head and chloroforming little pigs. I know and you know that we did not have 10-cent pork when we had high-priced feed grains. You have never had cheap pork, you have never had cheap beef when you had a fair price for feed. Cheap feed always brings cheap hogs.



Cheap feed brings cheap cattle. The only way you are going to help the livestock industry and raise it out of the doldrums in which it now flounders is to give us some kind of restrictions on the ever-increasing production of feed. And yet the President vetoes the only hope that this Nation has ever had to restrict in any way, in any orderly manner, our production of feed.

We came in here with a carefully worked out bill, one that kept the relationship between corn and the other feed grains fair and equitable; a bill which we had worked out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, because we did not just sit there in conference and draw figures out of the air. In that conference committee we had the experts from the Department of Agriculture with us to see that we kept the proper ratios between corn and other grains. We provided that the acreages of these feed crops must be reduced. That is the only way you are going to solve this great problem of too much corn, this problem of too many hogs, this problem of too much lard, of too cheap pork, and help the bankrupt farmer in Iowa and the cowman in New Mexico.

We offered you and we offer you today an opportunity to put shoes on the children throughout that great area of the United States. We offer you an opportunity to put carpets on the floors of the homes throughout the great breadbasket of America. Are you over here on my left going to say that you are so carried away with the agricultural knowledge of a great general, who never farmed a day in his life, that you are going to substitute his judgment for the judgment that you yourselves passed here just 1 week ago today? I assume that you acted in good faith and in good conscience then. I assume that you were correct when you told your constituents, 45 of you told your constituents, that you believed that you were passing a good bill for them then. Let us see how you vote today.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleague from North Carolina. Some of us had thought originally that, as he said at the outset, possibly about everything possible had been said on this matter, and there was some idea that possibly he would state the majority position and we would let it go at that. But since that route was not followed, then I think some of the things that have been said need to be clarified.

First of all, let me say this, and there is no one here to deny it: We have in Dwight D. Eisenhower a President of the United States who is respected and admired certainly as much if not more than any President in my time.

There is another thing that ought to be understood on both sides of the aisle, because I have heard many protestations since he took office that the right-hand, Democratic, side of the aisle supports the President better than we support him on our Republican side of the

aisle. We are about to find out about that. So I am not at all sorry about this vote coming along on this issue or that there has been some debate.

Actually, as to any suggestion that the President does not know what is in this bill or the action that he took on the veto, I say to you people I have sat in conferences with him and he does know. I know what I am talking about, and I must say some of the rest of you do not know what you are talking about in that regard.

I have been here nearly 22 years. I will say again for President Eisenhower that he has shown more respect for constitutional processes, yes, more respect for legislative prerogatives and responsibilities, than any President we have had for a long time. We have seen evidences of that time and time again.

I listened as always with interest to the gentleman from North Carolina, and I must say if I ever heard him make a defensive speech that was it. He is trying to explain away the delay. It would seem as I listened to him that he waits upon the administration to write the legislation but then after the administration makes suggestions, why, such suggestions are not to be heeded or followed in connection with the legislation. I do not believe you can blow hot and cold on that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I will yield if the gentleman will give me a few more minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I have only a minute, but I would like to make one statement.

The SPEAKER. Whether the gentleman from Indiana yields is in his hands, not in the hands of someone else. That is his business.

Mr. COOLEY. Even up to this hour Mr. Benson has not asked for the \$1,200,000,000 that he wants.

Mr. HALLECK. I assume from that the gentleman means the appropriation?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. I disagree with the gentleman from North Carolina as to the statutory authority now existing in the law. I think that legislation is needed. May I say this. If you are the fathers of the soil bank plan, why did you disavow it? Why do you not get busy and bring out a soil bank plan which we know will be legal and right. The country is going to watch to see what you do about that part of the program in which we are all so interested. As a matter of fact, the Republican 80th Congress did not get much help from downtown, but we wrote a farm bill, a tax bill, and the Taft-Hartley bill. We accepted our responsibility as legislators. We went ahead and wrote what we felt we should write. You passed a bobtailed farm bill last summer with 90 percent supports in it and the milk program and the brucellosis program. If you wanted a soil bank then, why did you not put it in your bill? If you wanted a two-price system on wheat, why did you not put it in the bill? If you wanted supports, why did you not put them in the bill? If you wanted dual parity, why did you not put it in the bill? It took you a long time to find out, apparently, what

you wanted. Actually, that bill proposed in the other body all last fall. The President's proposal came here in January 9th. That was the nine point program. You knew then what the administration wanted, and you cannot explain the fact that more than 3 months elapsed from January 9 until the President got the bill on his desk. I know—I saw it quoted in the paper—my very dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] who is now so concerned about the farmer getting some money this summer—he was the one, if he was quoted correctly, who wanted to see to it that none of the money went to the farmers before November. I do not accuse anyone of playing politics, but I must say at times it looks to me as though there has been some pretty rank delay. Now, then, I do not know whether I understood the gentleman from North Carolina correctly or not, but if I did, I must say I have never been shocked by any statement as I was just a few moments ago when he said that the farm program is paramount to the program of peace and the problem of peace. I just do not believe that. I think the farmers of this country want this Nation kept at peace. I do not think they want their price problems solved by getting into another war. Certainly, this farm problem has been building up and all of us have been trying to do something about it. Certainly, we ought to do something about it. When you came in with this conference report, we pointed out to you that there were things in it which were completely unacceptable and which were objectionable, and we devised a motion to recommit not to take out all of the things that were objectionable, but to get them down to a bare minimum. You were told that if you did not vote for that motion to recommit, the bill would be vetoed. Then what did you do? You chose to charge headlong into a situation which you knew could not prevail. I predict right here and now that there will be a majority of Representatives who will vote to sustain the President's veto here in just a few minutes. May I say to my friends who voted for the conference report that at that time I said in debate that if the motion to recommit did not prevail, you would go back to existing law which was 75 percent, and wheat would be supported at \$1.73 and likewise corn would be supported at a lesser figure. Now with reference to this matter of voting to sustain the veto. What happened? The President has moved administratively, if we had not abdicated our responsibility and authority in that regard. So the President has said that the support price on wheat will be \$2 and that the support price on corn will be \$1.50 and on rice \$4.50. Tobacco will be supported as it is presently, and milk will be \$3.25 a hundredweight and butterfat 58.6 cents. So now you have that part of it—the very thing we tried to do to clean up the bill when we had the motion to recommit. But, as I say, you would not pay any attention to our efforts then.

The President has moved administratively to improve the farm condition, and it is improving. I sold my corn the other day for \$1.30. I should have held

on to it. I sold my soybeans for \$2.23, and they hit \$2.86. That is away above parity. Hogs came back to \$16. We will work this thing out if you will just help.

Now, certainly for anyone who voted for the conference report there is no inconsistency in voting to sustain the veto today. I have here the editorial comment from daily papers in my own State of Indiana. All of them call this bill a monstrosity or something worse. The United Press took a poll of farmers in Indiana. Overwhelmingly they said the President ought to veto the bill.

I have a clipping from the news wire, quoting Governor Lausche, of Ohio:

Gov. Frank J. Lausche says it would have been shameful for President Eisenhower to have signed the farm bill.

Further:

The President would have compromised everything noble he has stood for all of his life if he had signed the bill, which was a bad bill—

The Democratic Governor said in an interview.

Lausche said if the President had signed the bill "he would have put himself in the role of just another common politician."

The Governor said that "the legislators in Congress put everything they could in that bill to get a few votes."

Lausche said that if he had been faced with the issue of signing the bill, "I would have vetoed it quicker than the President did."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No. If the gentleman differs with his Governor, and that is entirely possible, perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina will give him some time, but I cannot yield.

Now, here we are. The question is, Are we going to stand by what we believe is right? I know that there are Members here whose standing with me has always been high however they voted, and it always will be high. Personally, I do not charge any single Member with any lack of courage or any playing of politics. I think there can be honest differences of opinion about what is best for the country, and I respect those differences. But I know from talking with the greatest farm leaders in the country and by conversations I have had with the dirt farmers who realize we have to make some adjustments in the transition from war to peace—I know that this bill as it went to the President was not good for the farmers, and if it was not good for the farmers it could not be good for the country, and the veto should be sustained overwhelmingly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone who has had anything to do with agriculture in the House knows that I have been a strong supporter of the soil bank plan for more than 3 years. I was a supporter of this measure long before the Department of Agriculture had ever given it any consideration.

Melvin Gehlbach of Lincoln, Ill., a constituent of mine, was the originator of the soil bank plan. Members of the

House Committee on Agriculture will recall that Mr. Gehlbach was the first person ever to testify before that committee about the soil bank. That testimony was first rendered in June of 1953 before the subcommittee which was having grassroots hearings at Bloomington, Ill. Ever since that day, the soil bank has been growing in the estimation of the thinkers on agriculture in this body. Eight months later, early in 1954, two bills—one by Mr. MARSHALL and another by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, both of Minnesota—were introduced in the House. I supported both of those bills.

I supported the present bill under consideration when it was before the House on a conference report, a week ago. I supported this legislation because I believed that the soil bank plan was the heart of that bill. The soil bank is the only plan or suggestion in the 6 years I have been in this Congress which I felt would have a real impact on agricultural surpluses in the country. This plan is an incentive method to the farmer of reducing acreage. Reduction in acreage is the only solution I can see whereby we can get a reduction in overall supply.

For the last hour I have been hearing a great deal of discussion on both sides of this bill. It seems to me too much of what has been said is essentially destructive. In these 2 minutes, I hope I can lend something constructive to this discussion.

I do not believe there is a colleague sitting in this House now who believes that the President's veto will be overridden. I voted for the bill on last Wednesday. To be consistent, I shall vote for the bill today. However, I do believe now we should begin to think where we are when this vote is finished.

The soil-bank plan is supported by 9 out of each 10 Members on both sides of the aisle. This part of the farm bill has almost unanimous support. We should begin immediately to take the heart of the present bill, the soil-bank plan, and pass it as separate legislation.

I am not interested in credit. I will be perfectly willing to yield credit to anyone in either party who will help get this needed legislation passed.

I was somewhat disappointed when my colleague, the chairman of this great committee, a few minutes ago said he believed the Secretary of Agriculture had all of the authority he needed to put a soil-bank plan into operation. I believe I am somewhat familiar with most of the legislation on farm problems. In my opinion, no country lawyer after reading all of the legislation having to do with this problem would render a decision that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to put into effect the kind of a soil bank which is contained in the bill under discussion. The Secretary must have the additional legislation contained in this bill or similar legislation in order to get the soil bank started.

Therefore, I hope that partisan feelings will not enter too much into further consideration of this important problem. It is true it is too late to implement the soil-bank plan in 1956. However, unless

we pass such a plan this year, we cannot have it ready in time to be of assistance in 1957. This surplus problem will be with us unless we put into operation this or similar legislation. And, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will use all of your influences with the great Committee on Agriculture to get out a bill covering the soil-bank plan only on which this House can vote in 1956. I am sure you know as well as I do that such a plan would pass this House overwhelmingly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] made a few points in his speech to which I think some reply ought to be made.

He stated that the Democrats claim credit for giving the President better support than the Republicans do. I might say that on this issue Democrats have given the President better support than have Republicans, more especially if you gauge the support by our effort to help the President carry out his galloping campaign promises of 4 years ago.

In 1952, Candidate Eisenhower outbid the Democrats for the farm vote when he promised farmers 100 percent of parity. The 90-percent bid he made at Brookings, S. Dak., turned out to be not good enough for him. He upped it to 100 percent and took the farm issue right out of the campaign.

Here at least we have gone as far as we could to help the President carry out his campaign promises and at the same time stand by our own, but our good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], along with most of his Republican colleagues, have done just to the contrary. They have ignored and forgotten those promises. Unfortunately, so has the President.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] indicated that the 80th Republican Congress did not get much help from the White House and the downtown departments. Well, they were not entitled to much. With Democrats not being responsible in the least for the results, the Republican 80th Congress wrote a record that immediately helped Republicans out of office at the next election. They committed suicide. Had Democrats downtown joined in, the coroner's verdict, instead of being "suicide," would have read "Murder at the hands of Democrats."

Our distinguished friend from Indiana also defended the President in his criticism of the Congress for failing to do legislatively what he, the President, is now doing administratively. Well, of all things, the President is a grown man; so is the gentleman from Indiana. Had it been possible to do these things administratively, why did he and Benson announce last early winter that they would have a new farm program ready for this session of the Congress? Why do they fuss about all of the so-called delay? Why didn't Mr. Eisenhower, who seemingly can do no wrong, make no mistakes and commit no error—why didn't he then and there take the administrative action? Why did he send a farm message to us on January 9? What



has he and Secretary Benson been waiting on all this time?

He referred also to a statement issued by Governor Lausche, of Ohio, in which Lausche supports the veto. He said Mr. Lausche is a Democrat. I do not know; I have never seen Mr. Lausche. I have heard of him, and the statement which is accredited to him is not the first Republican utterance the Governor is said to have made. May I also point out that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana very carefully avoided making reference to three distinguished Republican governors from Iowa, South Dakota, and Kansas, respectively, who made a flying night ride to Washington and appealed to the President to sign the bill. They thought it was all right. And they thought enough of it to come to Washington so as to make a personal appeal in support of it. If we are to measure the correctness and merits of the bill by governors who have crossed party lines, the score is 3 to 1 in favor of the bill.

One other point. The gentleman indicated that he should have held his corn. He certainly should have. And measured by the action announced in the President's veto message, he might have done well to have held it until just before election. The President may have had the urge, acting administratively, to give corn supports another raise. It would have vote appeal, you know.

In the veto message the President announced several increases in price supports—wheat, corn, rice, manufacturing milk, and butter.

Could it be that the administration is playing a little politics? Could it be that the raises, coming after the support prices were already announced, constitute just a little political bait for the November election? I am making no charges. But it is exceeding strange that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson waited until this late date to raise these support prices. The timing seems to be unusually coincidental with the unpopular veto.

This administration had announced the support price on wheat at \$1.81 per bushel, or 76 percent of parity. That was for this year, 1956; but when he sent the veto he sent along with it another bid for the wheat vote, or was it a bid? I just cannot help but feel that they became alarmed over their first announced support price of 76 percent of parity on wheat and decided the results might be fatal. Seeing the difficulty confronting them, they announced a new support price for wheat—\$2 per bushel, or almost 84 percent of parity, a raise of 8 percent.

Could it be that the administration was concerned about the vote in the Wheat Belt? Why did they not stick by their guns, by their first announced support price of 76 percent of parity? Could it be that this was to temper the disappointment that would come to wheat farmers for knocking them out of 90 percent of parity and also burying the two-price program for which they and the National Grange have fought so long?

The administration had also previously set the price support on corn at 81 percent of parity. For 1956 corn. When the veto message came over, they tinkered with corn supports, too. I will

not say absolutely they were playing politics with the Corn Belt, but it is rather strange they would fix the price, as they did some time ago, on 1956 corn at 81 percent of parity and then on vetoing the farm bill announce that corn support was going to be raised to 86.2 percent of parity. Why was this announcement tied in with the veto message? Could it be because the Republican Governor of Iowa had told Eisenhower what the political consequences would be if he vetoed the farm bill and failed to up the price support on corn? You know Iowa is a corn State. And you know there is talk of a political upheaval out there among the corn farmers. Why did not Eisenhower and Benson fix the price support on corn at 86.2 percent of parity in the beginning? Now I am not saying all of this is political, however, it looks mighty, mighty suspicious. But, of course, we are told like would not think of playing politics, oh, no, not at all. He is much too big for that.

Could it be that the administration after it had set the price support for 1956 on manufacturing milk became concerned about the political situation in the Dairy Belt? I am not making the charge, just throwing out the inquiry. Eisenhower and Benson had set the 1956 price support on manufacturing milk at 82 percent of parity, but when the veto message came over they raised it to 84 percent of parity. They had set the 1956 price support for butter at 78 percent of parity but when the veto message was sent over they announced that it would be raised to 81 percent of parity.

I just do not understand this sort of administrative action. Furthermore, the timing of the raises makes me rather suspicious. We all know that wheat, corn, manufacturing milk and butterfat are the substantial farm products of the Midwest and upper Midwest. We also know that some political primaries have just been held out there and that they indicate an upheaval among farmers against the administration's program. We also know that these farmers are unhappy with the original levels at which the administration set the price supports. We also know that many midwestern Republican Senators and Representatives voted for the farm bill and urged the President to sign it. We also know that 3 Republican governors from the Midwest flew into Washington and made a similar appeal to the President. Now, I ask in all seriousness, how does it happen that the increases in price supports for this particular section of the country are simultaneously announced along with and as a part of the veto message. Never before have I heard of support prices being announced by way of a veto message. They usually come directly from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Is all of this political? Be your own judge.

There were two notable exceptions to this sudden increase in price supports—cotton and peanuts. Where are they grown? They are grown down in the deep South, where there are very few Republicans, thank goodness. They did nothing for cotton. Cotton farmers were written off. They did nothing for pea-

nuts. The peanut farmers were written off. But they did not write off the Wheat Belt; they gave them a raise. They did not write off the Corn Belt, they gave them a raise. They did not write off the Dairy Belt, they gave them a raise. And although Mr. Benson had sent a letter to a Member of the other body—in an effort, I must say, to persuade Cotton Belt Senators to support his policies in which he indicated to them he would support cotton at about 87 percent of parity, yesterday he announced the support price for cotton at only 82½ percent of parity. But this is in keeping with Republican failures to go through with their promises.

Also, it is very strange indeed that this administration has waited until such a late date—later than ever before—to announce the price support on cotton. Could it be that this was intended to put a squeeze on Senators and Representatives from the deep South?

Action of the administration is a bold, barefaced discrimination against cotton. They fix price supports on wheat, corn, manufacturing milk and butter. Then when the heat is on they raise the support levels. They withhold the announcement of price support on cotton but indicate that it may be around 87 percent. Then after the fight is over they beat us over the head with the lowest support of all—82½ percent. Such discrimination I have never seen.

And for the poor lowly peanut, another crop of the deep South, they have made no announcement at all.

I just wonder what cotton and peanuts would be supported at if they were produced in the Midwest, the center of the farm revolt.

We will let the people look at the record and determine for themselves who is playing politics and where it is being played. You may think you can appease farmers of the Midwest with this slight increase in support prices. Come November you will get the verdict. It will then be the turn of my Republican friends to weep.

The discrimination of which this administration is guilty against southern cotton and peanut farmers will be felt in every Southern farm home. It will be difficult for us to bear. Already the southern cotton farmer is living in a depression. His acreage has been cut back and back and back. Now his price is to be cut and the cut is even deeper than that administered to other major commodities such as wheat, corn and milk.

But southerners have lived through other discriminations practiced against them by the Republican Party. We will make it through this, too. The going will be tough but we will make it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say this about the great golfing Governor of Ohio who reputedly shoots a lower score than the President and who has through his opposition to adequate financing tried to ruin the school system of Ohio and who in his

tenure as Governor has permitted Ohio's highways to deteriorate until they are among the worst in the Nation. Knowing him as I do, perhaps I should say in my opinion, he would have kicked the farmers of the Nation in the teeth before he teed off on the first hole; he wouldn't have waited to have a conference in the golf shop on the ninth hole.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything further but the gentleman from Indiana made some reference to certain observations of mine and I did not desire to interrupt him at that time. I want to make perfectly clear what I said a moment ago when I stated that the problems of agriculture were paramount to the problem of peace. I meant by that, and I thought everyone understood, that we are living in a very hungry world. We are complaining here in this country about the problem of plenty. Regardless of what party is directing the destinies of this Nation, we must learn something about the art of distribution. We cannot hope to live long at peace in a world that is as hungry as are many parts of the world in which we live.

I want to conclude on this price support matter by saying that it seems to me the differences now involved are more or less inconsequential in view of the magnitude of the problem with which we are dealing. The fact remains that all of this talk about price supports has been going on for the last 3 years. Even now for last year's crop 3 of the 6 basic commodities are supported at 90 percent of parity.

With reference to sugar—and there is not a pound of sugar produced in North Carolina or in my district—it is being supported by this administration at more than 98 percent of parity. Wool is being supported at 106 percent of parity. Both of these commodities are raised in Utah, Colorado, and other places out there. I am not saying that Mr. Benson's views are governed or influenced by geography, but the fact is that sugar is used in the households of America and it does not have to be supported at 98 percent of parity, yet it is. He has not advocated lowering the sugar support price. He can lower it overnight just by administrative order.

So when we sum up all this talk about price supports, it seems to me that he has not been practicing what he has been preaching for the last 3 years.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 211, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—202

Abbutt	Andersen,	Aspinall
Abernethy	H. Carl	Avery
Addonizio	Andrews	Barden
Albert	Anfuso	Barrett
Alexander	Ashmore	Bass, Tenn.

Belcher	Gregory	O'Hara, Ill.
Bell	Griffiths	O'Konski
Bennett, Fla.	Gross	O'Neill
Berry	Hardy	Passman
Blitch	Harris	Patman
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Pfost
Bonner	Hayworth	Plicher
Bowler	Hoeven	Poage
Brooks, La.	Hollfield	Polk
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Price
Buckley	Huddleston	Priest
Burdick	Hull	Rabaut
Burleson	Ikard	Rains
Byrd	Jarman	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Jennings	Rhodes, Pa.
Cannon	Jensen	Richards
Carlyle	Johnson, Wis.	Riley
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Chatham	Jones, N. C.	Rodino
Chelf	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Christopher	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Colmer	Keogh	Roosevelt
Cooley	Kilgore	Rutherford
Cooper	King, Calif.	Selden
Davidson	Kirwan	Shelley
Davis, Ga.	Klein	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Shuford
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Sieminski
Deane	Krueger	Sikes
Dempsey	Landrum	Simpson, Ill.
Denton	Lanham	Sisk
Dies	Lankford	Smith, Kans.
Diggs	LeCompte	Smith, Miss.
Dingell	Lesinski	Spence
Dollinger	Long	Springer
Dolliver	Love	Steed
Dorn, S. C.	McCarthy	Sullivan
Dowdy	McCormack	Talle
Doyle	McDowell	Teague, Tex.
Durham	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Eberhart	Machrowicz	Thompson, N. J.
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Elliott	Madden	Thornberry
Evins	Magnuson	Trimble
Feighan	Mahon	Tuck
Fisher	Marshall	Tumulty
Flood	Matthews	Vinson
Flynt	Metcalf	Watts
Forrester	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Fountain	Mills	Whitten
Frazier	Morrison	Wickersham
Garmatz	Moss	Wier
Gathings	Moulder	Williams, Miss.
George	Multer	Willis
Gordon	Murray, Ill.	Winstead
Granahan	Murray, Tenn.	Wright
Grant	Natcher	Zablocki
Gray	Norrell	Zelenko
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.	

NAYS—211

Adair	Chenoweth	Gavin
Alger	Chipperfield	Gubser
Allen, Calif.	Church	Gwinn
Allen, Ill.	Clark	Hagen
Andersen,	Clevenger	Hale
August H.	Cole	Halleck
Arends	Coon	Hand
Ashley	Corbett	Harden
Auchincloss	Coudert	Harrison, Nebr.
Ayres	Cramer	Harrison, Va.
Bailey	Cretella	Harvey
Baker	Crumpacker	Hébert
Baldwin	Cunningham	Henderson
Bass, N. H.	Curtis, Mass.	Herlong
Bates	Curtis, Mo.	Heslton
Baumhart	Dague	Hess
Beamer	Davis, Wis.	Hiestand
Becker	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Bennett, Mich.	Delaney	Hillings
Bentley	Derounian	Hinshaw
Betts	Devereux	Hoffman, Mich.
Boland	Dixon	Holmes
Bolton,	Dodd	Holt
Frances P.	Dondero	Holtzman
Bolton,	Donohue	Horan
Oliver P.	Dorn, N. Y.	Hyde
Bosch	Ellsworth	James
Bow	Engle	Jenkins
Boyle	Fallon	Johansen
Bray	Fascell	Jonas
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	Judd
Brownson	Fernandez	Kean
Broyhill	Fino	Kearney
Budge	Fjare	Kearns
Burnside	Fogarty	Keating
Bush	Forand	Kelly, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford	Kilburn
Canfield	Frelinghuysen	King, Pa.
Carrigg	Friedel	Knox
Cederberg	Fulton	Laird
Chase	Gary	Lane

Latham	Pillion	Staggers
Lipscomb	Poff	Taber
McConnell	Powell	Taylor
McCulloch	Prouty	Teague, Calif.
McDonough	Quigley	Thomas
McGregor	Radwan	Thompson,
McIntire	Ray	Mich.
McVey	Reece, Tenn.	Thomson, Wyo.
Macdonald	Reed, N. Y.	Tollefson
Mack, Wash.	Rees, Kans.	Udall
Mailliard	Rhodes, Ariz.	Utt
Martin	Riehlman	Vanik
Mason	Robeson, Va.	Van Pelt
Meador	Robson, Ky.	Van Zandt
Merrrow	Rogers, Fla.	Velde
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Vorys
Miller, Nebr.	Sadiak	Vursell
Miller, N. Y.	St. George	Wainwright
Minshall	Saylor	Westland
Morano	Schenck	Wharton
Mumma	Schwengel	Widnall
Nelson	Scott	Wigglesworth
Nicholson	Scrivner	Williams, N. J.
Norblad	Scudder	Wilson, Calif.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Ind.
Osmer	Sheehan	Withrow
Ostertag	Short	Wolverton
Patterson	Siler	Yates
Pelly	Simpson, Pa.	Young
Phillips	Smith, Va.	Younger
	Smith, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—20

Blatnik	Healey	Morgan
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Donovan	Hosmer	Scherer
Gamble	Jackson	Walter
Gentry	Johnson, Calif.	Williams, N. Y.
Green, Pa.	Kilday	Wolcott
Haley	Mollohan	

So (two-thirds not having voted in the affirmative) the bill was rejected, and the veto message and bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Healey and Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Walter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hosmers.

Mr. Gentry with Mr. Jackson.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. OSMERS, is recorded as answering to his name. I understand his name was called and he answered on the first call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. MARTIN. He was here on the first roll call and thinking his name was recorded he left. I understand the Chair cannot do anything about it.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as voting "No."

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman vote?

Mr. OSMERS. Yes, sir. I voted "Nay."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was present and listening and voted "Nay" when his name was called?

Mr. OSMERS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be recorded as voting "Nay."



Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the House has voted to sustain the veto of the President, thereby reducing the income of the farmers of America by more than \$2 billion in this year, 1956.

It is easy to understand how some Members may have been misled in believing that it will be possible to enact legislation which will supplant or be substituted for the relief which was carried in H. R. 12, but unfortunately that is not the case.

As was so clearly pointed out by our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, any money made available through a soil bank program is not new income for the farmer; it would merely replace a portion of that income taken away from and which will be denied to the farmers of America through the veto of the farm bill by President Eisenhower.

As I stated at the time of the veto, President Eisenhower has evidenced his willingness to assume the criticism that has been directed at Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and to accept the responsibility for reducing the income of the farmers of the United States by not less than \$2 billion this year.

Likewise, the President's announcement of price supports on some of the basic commodities at not less than 82½ percent of parity will not have the effect of reducing production and will not have one iota of effect on reducing surpluses, but will only have the effect of reducing the income of farmers. This reduction of income to the farmers will likewise be felt throughout the economy of the entire Nation.

With all of this talk about integrity, principles and people, and if you please honesty, it reminds me of the "Honest John" character who was always going about bragging about his honesty and his principles in the hope that it would direct attention from his questionable reputation and his everyday activities.

With all of his platitudes about his concern for the farmers of America, President Eisenhower has never explained, to my satisfaction, how he squares his actions throughout the last 3 years with his pre-election statement made at Brookings, S. Dak., when he said:

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90.

I have time and time again called attention to the promise made to members of our House Committee on Agriculture by Secretary Benson that politics would have no part in the administration of the ASC program, yet he has stubbornly and consistently refused to demand that the program in Missouri be administered honestly, fairly, and legally. He has condoned the rewriting of regulations to

permit the payment of salaries to office managers who had been fired by farmer-elected county committees who have been stripped of any authority which they may have had for administering the programs at the county level.

While he concurred in the report of the Department of Agriculture which disapproved of the soil-bank program which was proposed more than a year ago, on the grounds that it was unworkable and that the estimated cost of \$490 million annually was prohibitive, he now recommends a program that would admittedly cost more than a billion dollars to be distributed on an arbitrary basis, and in advance of proof of compliance. And still there are some who will contend that the President and his Secretary of Agriculture are not playing politics with the farm vote.

The arbitrary actions of the Secretary of Agriculture were further pointed up this week, when on April 17, he arbitrarily announced that the support price on the 1956 cotton crop would be 82½ percent of parity. I guess he thinks the cotton farmers of America should be most grateful to him for not setting the price at 75 percent of parity, and admittedly he could have done this. And of course the President will tell the voters in the cotton section this fall that he was good to them by assuring them support prices of 82½ percent of parity, rather than the 75 percent minimum which the collapsible price-support system would have permitted. But he may have a hard time explaining why he did not set the support at 90 percent of parity which he could just as easily have done. And do not forget this, my friends, the level of price support will not have one bit of effect on the production of cotton this year. The only effect will be on the income of the farmers who grow this crop.

And I wonder how the Secretary of Agriculture will explain his proposed deal offered in the Senate when the farm bill was up for consideration there. It is a well known fact that he was willing to guarantee price supports of no less than 87½ percent if the Senate would give him a flexible price-support bill. There is no question but what he was able to get some votes on this promise, but his promise of 87½ percent price supports for cotton in 1956 will amount to as much as the President's promise of 90 percent price supports made to the farmers of America back in the fall of 1952.

And, I wonder how the Secretary of Agriculture will try to explain his actions in waiting so long to announce the price supports for cotton in this year, 1956. He waited until a large portion of the crop was planted in the South; some has even been planted in the northernmost sections of the Cotton Belt; and plans had been completed for all planting before April 17 when this announcement was made, almost 2 months later than the announcement is ordinarily made. Will the Secretary of Agriculture have the audacity to say that politics did not enter into that announcement?

February 21, was the date that the announcement was made in 1952. In 1953 this announcement was made on

February 26; March 3, 1954; and it was as early as February 23, that the announcement was made last year. Yet, during this election year the Secretary appears to have held this uncertainty over the heads of the Members of Congress as a whip to get his particular version of the farm bill passed. By his proposed "deal" he has admitted that he has the power to manipulate and to arbitrarily fix the support prices, not only on cotton, but on all other basic commodities. With one stroke of the pen he has seen fit to knock \$15 a bale from the price of cotton, which translated into the 14 million bale crop of this past year is well over \$200 million. If he is still in the saddle I shudder to think what will happen to the cotton farmers in 1957.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Finance and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 474) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the vice chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. And at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the reading of the resolution, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 10387.

This resolution came out of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously and the rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. It makes the resolution in order. It is an open rule. Debate is limited to 1

hour. The bill made in order, H. R. 10387, has to do with construction by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, and no objection to the resolution.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10387, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in behalf of H. R. 10387, an original bill unanimously reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which authorizes the appropriation of \$295,495,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission to be used for construction or expansion of existing facilities or acquisition or condemnation of any real property.

As you may recall, last year was the first time that the Atomic Energy Commission was required to seek such authorization. When the original Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was revised in late 1954, a new provision of law was included requiring the Atomic Energy Commission to seek authorization for moneys to be utilized for construction or acquisition purposes. This provision is identified as section 261 of Public Law 703 and reads as follows:

SEC. 261. Appropriation: There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act except such as may be necessary for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

The first part of this section grants general authorization for the appropriation of money needed by the Atomic Energy Commission for operating purposes. The latter portion of the above cited section, however, specifically provides that each year authority must be sought for any moneys to be used for construction or acquisition purposes.

The initial authority last year—which became Public Law 141—established the

format and general limitations upon the expenditure of such money. H. R. 10387, now before us, follows the identical pattern.

Section 101 contains a list of the projects identified by numbers. This section is broken down into general categories which relate to major programs being carried on by the Commission. It is further subdivided for purposes of setting specific limitations under which the various projects may be started when the deviation is at variance from the estimate originally prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In section 102 these deviations are detailed.

Section 103 authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes for advance planning, construction, design, and architectural services it deems necessary but which are not otherwise authorized by law.

Section 104 of the bill authorizes the appropriations of funds necessary to restore or replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged. In addition the Commission is authorized to use such funds as may be currently or otherwise available to it under these emergency conditions.

Section 105 of the bill authorizes the Commission to utilize not only the moneys authorized to be appropriated in section 101 of this bill but also any other funds which may be currently available to it for accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

Section 106 authorizes the Commission under certain specific procedures to substitute within the limits of money authorized by this bill a new project, the estimate for which is not contained in this bill.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on the projects identified in this bill and is satisfied that these items are essential to the national defense and to the furtherance of the civilian application of atomic energy.

Inasmuch as the gentleman from California who is chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings on this matter is completely familiar with the details of these projects, I would therefore ask him to give a more detailed discussion of the bill and answer such questions as the Members may desire to ask.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today H. R. 10387, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

This bill was reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in conformance with its statutory responsibility under section 261 of Public Law 703.

The Committee, through its duly appointed Subcommittee on Legislation, heard testimony from the Atomic Energy Commission in defense of each of the

individual items set forth in this bill, the total of which amounts to \$295,495,000.

You will note that this bill authorizes the appropriation of moneys to be used for construction and acquisition purposes only. The AEC request for operating expenses for fiscal year 1957 is now before the House Appropriations Committee for consideration. It is therefore a matter of some urgency that this bill, H. R. 10387, receive early floor action in order that both the Commission's operating budget and construction budget requests be considered by the House Appropriations Committee simultaneously.

The bill as reported out carried language under section 102 which strictly defines the latitude the agency has in expending this money. This is identical in every respect with the provisions of the similar bill reported out for the first time last year and which became Public Law 141.

The Committee is familiar with the programs for which this money is intended to be spent and based on its knowledge thereof concurs in such expenditures. It is the Committee's judgment that these programs are essential to the national defense and to the rapid exploitation of atomic energy for peaceful uses.

Perhaps a brief general description of what the AEC proposes to use the money for which this bill authorizes would be in order. Out of the overall \$295,495,000, to be authorized, \$113 million is to be used for the construction of new and urgently needed facilities to further reactor development. Aside from the weapons program, this is probably the most important responsibility the Commission has. It therefore proposes to continue at the present high rate the development of specialized reactors for both military and peacetime uses. For example, research in nuclear propulsion of aircraft has advanced to the point where the Commission is in urgent need of new and more extensive facilities at its Arco testing station for the advanced testing of nuclear propulsion systems for aircraft. It will be unnecessary to acquire any more land for this construction program.

The next general category is authorization for \$70.6 million to be utilized for the construction and additions to existing weapons fabricating facilities. This construction is urgently needed to meet not only the increasing rate at which weapons are being manufactured, but also to permit the production of new types of weapons as they are proven in.

The next largest item is \$57 million which the Commission plans to expend for improvements to existing fissionable material production facilities. The committee deems this to be a proper expenditure since for a relatively small sum of money as related to the value of the existing facilities, the efficiency and production rate can be enhanced rapidly and significantly. These improvements in efficiency and production can be brought about sooner and at less cost than would be the case if the Commission undertook to construct completely new facilities.



The Commission plans to expend \$28.6 million for construction purposes to further its physical research program. Into this category falls the construction of newer particle accelerators, a highly important research tool essential to more profound studies of the nature and behavior of the atom.

Three million two hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars will be expended in the Commission's raw materials program. Of this amount, \$400,000 is for the construction of a new central analytical laboratory which will analyze the uranium ore bought by the Commission. This is an essential function to assure the proper payment for the uranium content of the ore. The balance in an amount of \$2,800,000, is for the construction of approximately 200 miles of new access roads and improvements on 106 miles of old roads in the Colorado Plateau area. These roads are necessary for the continued development of highly productive mines which have been located at distances from main highways. This program of construction of access roads has been in effect for several years and is handled in behalf of the Commission by the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Four hundred thousand dollars will be expended for miscellaneous small construction items necessary to the furtherance of the AEC's program on medicine and biology.

Five hundred and fifty-four thousand dollars will be expended for community construction projects. This item consists of two projects: \$359,000 to develop a new residential site at Los Alamos Laboratory where employees of that important research center may acquire home sites and construct their own homes; the other project is \$195,000 for the construction of new elementary school rooms. These rooms will be added to existing school buildings at Los Alamos.

One million one hundred and seventeen thousand dollars, carried under the administrative construction program consist of \$600,000 to convert barracks at the Sandia Base in New Mexico into office space, and \$517,000 to renovate a building for the AEC's technical information service at Oak Ridge.

Finally, \$21 million is carried as a miscellaneous construction fund. This money is generally divided among the various AEC operations offices. This amount of money is for miscellaneous small improvements, additions, and unanticipated small construction projects which might occur during the fiscal year.

You will note that, as in the past, the joint committee and its authorized subcommittee considered this bill primarily from a programmatic basis. Although H. R. 10387 indicates specific sums of money, the final determination will, of course, be made by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses. What we of the joint committee propose by means of this bill is to indicate that after a thorough review of the Commission's plan for the coming fiscal year, these items and these estimates of money appear to be reasonable and it is our considered opinion that the facilities are

essential to a continuation of the Commission's program, both for national defense purposes and for peaceful applications.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman from California on his statement.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the report accompanying this bill and the statements just submitted to the House by the two distinguished gentlemen, members of the joint committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], very thoroughly cover the provisions of the bill with respect to its details, and I have no desire to be repetitious. I do think it might be of interest, however, to point out that the amount contained in this bill in comparison with a similar bill of last year is but slightly higher. That is occasioned principally I think by reason of a very sizable item in connection with the development of an airplane propelled by nuclear energy. So that for all practical purposes, the construction authorization, the plant construction and acquisition for the fiscal year 1957 is substantially the same as it was in 1956.

The question might be raised why it is, after a period of a decade of continuous expansion of the atomic-energy program, that we must expect each year that there will be further expansions in construction of various types of plants. It is inevitable in this program, I think, that as we learn more and more about the nonmilitary uses of atomic energy, we must expect a transition of construction requirements to occur by reason of the demand and the need for nonmilitary installations.

The amount contained in this bill for weapons, purely and exclusively weapons production is very, very slight, as the weapons production has continued apace. In recent years due to the very marked expansion of 3 or 4 years ago, of course, it was necessary to acquire additional land and build storage sites to accommodate the new weapons. But for the purpose of weapons production expansion there is little if any money in this program.

A large segment of the authorization in this bill is for the production of special nuclear materials. That does not necessarily mean that the special nuclear materials have for their purpose inclusion in the production or fabrication of weapons, because the same material that goes into a weapon may also be used to fuel an atomic furnace, an atomic reactor. Another large segment of the bill is for the development of reactors which have no military significance, no weapons significance whatever. So as we look to the future I think we should prepare to expect that as the years go along the Atomic Energy Commission will require additional funds for plant construction and plant expansion, but we can anticipate that the greater em-

phasis from here on out will be placed on meeting the needs to satisfy the non-military program of the Atomic Energy Commission rather than the military program.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission the sum of \$295,495,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, as follows:

(a) Special nuclear materials:

1. Project 57-a-1, additional feed-materials plant, \$22,200,000.
2. Project 57-a-2, improvements to reactor instrumentation, Hanford, Wash., \$8 million.
3. Project 57-a-3, improved high level waste handling system, Savannah River, \$5 million.
4. Project 57-a-4, reactor facility safety improvements, Hanford, Wash., \$5 million.
5. Project 57-a-5, additional waste disposal system, Hanford, Wash., \$5 million.
6. Project 57-a-6, charging and discharging system, Hanford, Wash., \$3,450,000.
7. Project 57-a-7, modifications to existing production facilities for increased efficiency and safety, Hanford, Wash., \$3 million.
8. Project 57-a-8, chemical processing facility, St. Louis, Mo., \$1,600,000.
9. Project 57-a-9, barrier plant automation, Oak Ridge, Tenn., \$1,400,000.
10. Project 57-a-10, reactor temperature test installation, Hanford, Wash., \$900,000.
11. Project 57-a-11, improvements to reactor cooling water effluent system, Hanford, Wash., \$550,000.
12. Project 57-a-12, fuel element heat-treating plant, Fernald, Ohio, \$500,000.
13. Project 57-a-13, renovation of service plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn., \$450,000.

(b) Atomic weapons:

1. Project 57-b-1, area 5 expansion \$20,900,000.
2. Project 57-b-2, weapons assembly plant, \$15 million.
3. Project 57-b-3, weapons production and development plant, \$15 million.
4. Project 57-b-4, weapons development and engineering facilities, Livermore, Calif., \$10 million.

5. Project 57-b-5, storage site modifications, \$2 million.

(c) Reactor development:

1. Project 57-c-1, aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test plant, area No. 2, Idaho, \$55 million.
2. Project 57-c-2, research and development test plant, \$15,900,000.
3. Project 57-c-3, modifications and expansion of aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test facilities, area No. 1, Idaho, \$15 million.
4. Project 57-c-4, small submarine reactor test facility, \$10 million.
5. Project 57-c-5, expended core handling and service plant, National Reactor Testing Station, \$4,750,000.
6. Project 57-c-6, food irradiation facility, \$3 million.
7. Project 57-c-7, project Sherwood plant, \$2 million.
8. Project 57-C-8, Argonne low power reactor facility, \$1,225,000.
9. Project 57-C-9, materials testing reactor hot cell extension, National Reactor Testing Station, \$310,000.

(d) Physical research:

1. Project 57-d-1, high energy accelerator, \$15 million.

2. Project 57-d-2, bevatron research plant, University of California Radiation Laboratory, \$1,084,000.

3. Project 57-d-3, 48-inch heavy particle cyclotron, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, \$459,000.

4. Project 57-d-4, conversion of accelerator design building, University of California Radiation Laboratory, \$300,000.

(e) Raw materials:

1. Project 57-e-1, analytical laboratory addition, Grand Junction, Colo., \$362,000.

(f) Atomic weapons:

1. Project 57-f-1, metallurgy laboratory, Livermore, Calif., \$2,270,000.

2. Project 57-f-2, base construction, Pacific proving ground, \$1,569,000.

3. Project 57-f-3, high explosive and weaponizing plant, Livermore, Calif., \$1,100,000.

4. Project 57-f-4, installation of 115 kilovolt tie line, Los Alamos, N. Mex., \$1 million.

5. Project 57-f-5, base construction, Nevada test site, \$543,000.

6. Project 57-f-6, manufacturing support plant, Kansas City, Mo., \$444,000.

7. Project 57-f-7, warehouse, Sandia, \$308,000.

8. Project 57-f-8, mechanical shop additions, Livermore, Calif., \$300,000.

9. Project 57-f-9, programming building, Livermore, Calif., \$180,000.

(g) Reactor development:

1. Project 57-g-1, addition to electrical power system, National Reactor Testing Station, \$3,800,000.

2. Project 57-g-2, chemistry cave for radioactive materials, Argonne National Laboratory, \$800,000.

3. Project 57-g-3, transient housing, Argonne National Laboratory, \$533,000.

4. Project 57-g-4, materials testing reactor maintenance shop, National Reactor Testing Station, \$235,000.

(h) Physical research:

1. Project 57-h-1, permanent research buildings, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, \$5,780,000.

2. Project 57-h-2, physics building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, \$2,140,000.

3. Project 57-h-3, engineering building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, \$1,879,000.

4. Project 57-h-4, engineering service building, University of California Radiation Laboratory, \$1,080,000.

5. Project 57-h-5, cosmotron target area, Brookhaven National Laboratory, \$350,000.

6. Project 57-h-6, 18-inch cyclotron building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, \$300,000.

7. Project 57-h-7, addition to heavy ion accelerator building, University of California Radiation Laboratory, \$200,000.

(i) Biology and medicine:

1. Project 57-i-1, reclamation plant and hot laundry, Brookhaven National Laboratory, \$400,000.

(j) Community:

1. Project 57-j-1, real-estate development program, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$359,000.

2. Project 57-j-2, elementary-school classrooms, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$195,000.

(k) Administrative:

1. Project 57-k-1, conversion of barracks for Albuquerque Operations Office headquarters, Sandia Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex., \$600,000.

2. Project 57-k-2, renovation of building for technical information services, Oak Ridge, Tenn., \$517,000.

(l) Raw materials:

1. Project 57-L-1, off-site access roads, \$2,873,000.

(m) Reactor development:

1. Project 57-m-1, purchase of Bettis Field property, \$400,000.

(n) General plant projects: \$21 million.

LIMITATIONS

Sec. 102. (a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (a) through 101 (d) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does

not exceed by more than 25 percent the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (e) through 101 (k) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 percent the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start the project set forth in subsection 101 (L) and (m) only if the currently estimated cost of the project does not exceed the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(d) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101 (n) only if it is in accordance with the following:

1. For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be \$10,000.

2. For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be \$500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such a project shall be \$100,000.

3. The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101 (n) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 percent.

Sec. 103. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

Sec. 104. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds necessary to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

Sec. 105. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission by section 101 of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the purposes of this act such sums of money as may be currently available to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sec. 106. Funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this act may be used to start any other new project for which an estimate was not included in this act if it be a substitute for a project authorized in subsections 101 (a), 101 (b), or 101 (f), and the estimated cost thereof is within the limit of cost of the project for which substitution is to be made, and the Commission certifies that—

(a) the project is essential to the common defense and security; and

(b) the new project is required by changes in weapon characteristics or weapon logistic operations;

(c) it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, including a licensee, on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided in the new project.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 1, line 3, strike out "That there" and insert "Sec. 101. There".

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Commit-

tee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 474, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 10387.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for the consideration of S. 1188, a bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I opposed this bill in the committee and I expect to oppose it on the floor, if I can get time from the committee chairman. I would like to have at least 10 minutes. I think surely that is a reasonable and modest request. Unless I can get that time, I would like



the gentleman to yield me time on the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman will be glad to yield the gentleman time on the rule, but I had understood the gentleman from Kentucky was prepared to yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman from Kentucky will do that, it will be all right.

Mr. SPENCE. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes, if other members of the committee do not need the time.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky says "if." Will the gentleman from Missouri yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. BOLLING. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to complete my statement first.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 429 makes in order consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

S. 1188 makes three changes in the present Federal law governing the examinations of national banks by the Comptroller of the Currency.

The first would permit the Comptroller to waive 1 of the 2 examinations required each year, but this waiver could not be exercised more often than once every 2 years. It is not proposed to waive one examination in all cases, but to adjust examination schedules to permit the examining staff to make more thorough examinations in banks that appear to require greater supervision.

The second change would permit the Comptroller to assess all national banks for examination services on a yearly basis regardless of whether 1 or 2 examinations are made. The assessments will continue to be based on the assets of the banks, but would be billed in installments.

The third change provides that the charges for the examinations of the trust departments of national and district banks shall be based on the cost of making the examinations rather than the amount of trust assets under administration since there is no standardization of practice in respect to carrying the value of trust assets.

The Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are in favor of these changes in the present law.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules reported out unanimously not only House Resolution 429 but two other rules, House Resolutions 430 and 431.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### TO AMEND SECTION 5146 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. At this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 430 makes in order consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

Present law requires that at least three-fourths of the directors of national banking associations must have resided in the State, Territory, or district in which the associations are located, or within 50 miles of the offices for at least 1 year immediately preceding their election as directors, and three-fourths of the directors must continue to maintain such residence during their terms in office.

S. 1736 would reduce the number of directors subject to the residence requirements from three-fourths to two-thirds. The number of directors of a national bank may not be less than 5 nor more than 25. Therefore, on most bank boards only 1 director position would be affected and on no board would more than 2 be affected.

The other change would increase the 50-mile residence limitation to 100 miles.

Federal law in these respects is more restrictive than that of many of the States and this bill will give national banks a wider range of selection of their directors.

The Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are in favor of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Unless I can get time from the chairman of the committee, I would like to have some time on the rule.

Mr. SPENCE. I will give the gentleman 10 minutes on each bill.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Com-

mittee on Banking and Currency reported this bill unanimously. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. It was not reported unanimously. I opposed the bill and I expect to oppose it here.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is the gentleman the only one opposing the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. No. I understand there are others who will oppose it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman corrected me.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TO AMEND SECTION 14 (b) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 431 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 431 makes in order consideration of the bill, H. R. 9285. House Resolution 431 provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

H. R. 9285 will extend until June 30, 1958, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amount not to exceed \$5 billion outstanding at any one time.

This direct borrowing authority permits the Treasury to carry smaller cash balances than it would otherwise feel obliged to maintain in order to meet its day to day needs. It is useful in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in the Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly in-

come tax payments. It is also a safeguard that could be used in the event of any sudden nationwide emergency requiring heavy cash payments from the Treasury before securities could be sold.

The proposed extension is given for 2 years only as the Banking and Currency Committee feels that such a power should be brought before the Congress for periodic review.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and have no requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the House Resolution 442, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5299) to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of debate on the bill.

The proposed park would be located on a portion of St. John and St. Thomas Islands, in the Virgin Islands, and would cover 9,500 acres. Mr. Laurence S. Rockefeller has already acquired over 5,000 acres for donation to the Government for the park, and the remainder of the park area would be acquired with funds to be donated. It is estimated that an initial investment of \$120,000 by the Government would be needed and approximately \$60,000 would be required annually for operation and maintenance.

The Virgin Islands Legislature adopted a resolution expressing its approval of the establishment of the park, stating in the resolution that the park would stimulate tourist trade and preserve historic sites and plant life.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 442 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 5299.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one opposed to the rule, although it is my understanding there is some opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1188, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a Senate bill that was passed by the Senate, as I understand it, without objection and without very much debate. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation asked that it be considered. We heard the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the American Bankers Association, all of whom were in favor of the bill. We considered the bill very carefully.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the bill should not be viewed with alarm. It merely provides that the law in regard to the examination of banks, which calls for 4 examinations every 2 years, shall be so amended that the Comptroller of the Currency may waive one of these examinations. The argument was put forth that some of the banks were in such condition that it is not necessary to examine them 4 times every 2 years and, therefore, it would give the examining body greater opportunity to discharge its duties more satisfactorily and that body would have time to apply its energies to matters where they were most needed. I cannot see anything fundamentally wrong, or anything to cause us any alarm.

The bill provides also that the banks will pay for the 4 examinations every 2 years whether they are made or not. So there will be no pressure to waive an examination in order to save the cost of the examination fee.

The bill also changes the method of determining the charge for examination of trust departments. Heretofore the examinations were charged for on the basis of assets. Under this bill the banks will pay the actual cost of the examinations.

Mr. Chairman, the changes, it seems to me, are not so fundamental or material that they should excite any alarm. As a matter of fact, I thought the bill would be placed on the Consent Calendar and be passed without much debate.

This is not my bill, but I feel that when the administration, whether it is my administration or an administration of a political party to which I do not belong, presents a matter, I should bring it before the Congress immediately for consideration. I ask for your consideration of this bill. I can see no harm in it. The people who are most vitally interested in the administration of the matter want it. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as well as the American Bankers Association are all in favor of it.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], has correctly stated the facts relating to this legislation. I most assuredly agree with him that this is a simple bill. There is nothing in it that could be considered earthshaking. It might well have been put on the Consent Calendar, except for the fact that in committee a request was made that a rule be asked for, and that was done.

May I, Mr. Chairman, emphasize one point that is important in this bill. The Comptroller of the Currency has found that it is not easy to develop and to keep an efficient corps of examiners. In view of the fact that this bill proposes that over a 2-year period there may be 3 examinations of some banks instead of 4, the Comptroller will have some latitude and he will be able to make better use of his work force. That is a telling argument and a very strong one in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for my taking more time. I do, however, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### LOOKS INNOCENT BUT VERY DANGEROUS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill seems to contain a very innocent proposal, something that you would normally not object to at all. I can see some serious objections to it myself.

No. 1: Under present law the banks are examined 4 times every 2 years. They must pay for those examinations. Under this proposal the Comptroller of the Currency may, in his discretion, reduce that number of certain banks to 3 every 2 years; in other words, it will be making first- and second-class banks out of the banks of the country. How will the bankers in your home town feel when the banks there are examined 4 times and the banks in the adjoining town, through a favor of the Comptroller of the Currency, are only examined 3 times, or 1 less? Some people will probably say, "Why? Does that mean that our bank is under suspicion? Why should our bank be a second-class bank? Why should we not have a first-class bank like the other town?" The truth is we should not change this law; we should keep it like it is and keep all the banks on the



same plane. Now, if you allow the Comptroller of the Currency to favor certain banks, that is a great advantage to these banks. What kind of supervision will the Congress have over them? The Congress will have no supervision over them. Congress will not even know the favors that are being granted.

#### NO AUDIT

May I invite your attention to this fact? And I especially ask the chairman of the committee to listen to this. The Comptroller of the Currency is not audited by the General Accounting Office or by the Comptroller General. Now, if the office of the Comptroller of the Currency was audited and investigated by the Comptroller General, then you would have a good argument for this bill, maybe. In the event of abuses, they would be pointed out by the Comptroller General. But the office of the Comptroller of the Currency is not audited by the General Accounting Office. Therefore it will be all in secret and any favors could be granted secretly; no supervision, no way to find it out; exempt from the Comptroller General, exempt from the General Accounting Office. Secret deals could be made. I am not saying they will be made. I have confidence in the present Comptroller of the Currency. I think he is a fine, honest, honorable man. I do not anticipate anything wrong being done or attempted to be done by him. It is not that. It is the possibility.

One of the basic things first agreed upon in the writing of our Constitution was that this shall be a government of laws and not a government of men. That was when the Articles of Confederation had failed and they had to write a new Constitution. And in writing that new Constitution they agreed upon certain basic principles. One of the first of those was that this shall be a government of laws and not a government of men.

Now here you are changing that. Here you have a good law that applies to all banks alike, all of them first-class banks; none of them second-class banks. You are changing that law and giving a man the power—a man-made law—to make the law and the rules and the regulations. You are getting away from that basic principle that this shall be a government of laws and not a government of men.

So it is wrong. This bill should not pass. There is no reason for it except to discriminate against certain banks and allow gross favoritism to others. You hear it said every day that if there has ever been a time when there should be close supervision of banks it is now. Instead of having fewer examinations, we should have more examinations. Let me tell you the reason for my statement. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act is one of the finest laws ever passed. It helped the banks, it helped the depositors, it helped the entire country. We were all for it. At first we had an assessment larger than now which the banks paid. The object of that small assessment was to accumulate a fund sufficient to represent a good reserve, a reserve sufficient to justify insurance of all the deposits in all the banks in the country. After we established that

assessment, the banks commenced to complain about it, saying that it was too much. In 1934 we had a fund in FDIC equal to \$2.02 per \$100 of liability which seems awfully small, \$2.02 for each \$100 of insurance liability. The banks complained about the assessments until we started to reduce it, and now it is only \$1.41 for each \$100 of liability. That seems pretty small. And if you include all deposits it comes to only 77 cents for each \$100 of the banks deposit liability.

Who is behind the FDIC? The other day a special train came to Washington. Each one of the delegates had a big badge and when he came in contact with a Member of Congress he would say, "Repeal all these socialistic laws. Repeal every law under which the Government is in business. We want the Government to get out of business. We do not want the Government supporting any business. We are against that. Repeal them all. It is socialism."

Understand, I am for the FDIC. I think it is a great thing. I would not change it if it were within my power. I might make the assessment a little bit larger for awhile to build up a sufficient reserve, or it is possible I would conclude the present reserve is sufficient. But it is a wonderful thing. And what I am saying is not in criticism of it but in answer to these people who are always saying, "Repeal these socialistic laws." If you applied their standard of socialism to the FDIC, it would be one of the most socialistic laws upon our statute books because the Government is absolutely supporting it, backing it.

I asked each witness, Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve; Mr. Gidney, and the rest of them, "What is behind the guarantee of bank deposits?" "The Government of the United States."

That is what is behind it. That little 77 cents or the \$1.41 does not amount to anything. It is the Government behind it. So if you are going to repeal socialistic laws, according to the standards that are given to us of the Government's supporting some business, this law would be the first to be repealed. But nobody wants it repealed. I do not even claim it is socialistic. My statement is to warn certain people not to use the charge too loosely.

This is not a time to let your guard down, this is a time to put your guard up. This is not a time to have fewer examinations, this is a time to have all examinations required by law and maybe more.

We do not want the same thing to happen that happened in this country one time in 1932 and 1933. Contrary to reports that all banks did not close, every bank in the United States closed its doors March 3, 1933. Every bank in America was closed.

There were over 30,000 banks at that time, and a lot of them did not open. A lot of them were consolidated and merged. Today we have only 14,000 banks, that is all; 14,000 banks. We ought to have a lot more than that. I know good communities that ought to have a bank that do not have a bank. Now is not the time to let our guard down, now is the time to hold it up. Now is not the time to say that we do not need

as many examinations, now is the time to say we need them all. Let us keep our eyes on these banks, not that they are dishonest, for they are not. The banks have done a wonderful job. I am for our capitalistic system, which is the finest and greatest system on earth. I am also for the private banking system which is allowed to operate at a satisfactory profit.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVey], a member of the committee.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I arise to the support of S. 1188, a bill relating to the examination of national banks. S. 1188 is being introduced at the request of the Treasury Department. It has also been approved by the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The present method of examining national banks is sometimes a waste of effort and an unnecessary expense on the part of national banks, since regulations provide that all national banks will be examined twice each year.

S. 1188 will make 3 important changes regarding the examination of national banks. The first change would permit the Comptroller, in his discretion, to waive 1 of the 2 examinations required each year, but this waiving of 1 examination could not be done more often than once every 2 years. If an examination is waived by the Comptroller, the result will be 3 examinations in a 2-year period instead of the present 4 examinations. Such an arrangement enables the Comptroller to use his examining personnel to a greater advantage. One difficulty in the present arrangement rests with the fact that a national bank in sound condition, which has been favored with the best of management personnel over a period of years, may be subjected to a second examination soon after the first one has been completed. This second examination is a waste of time and money on the part of the Federal Government.

A second change would permit the Comptroller to assess all national banks for examination services on a yearly basis regardless of whether 1 or 2 examinations are made. These assessments will be based upon the assets of banks, and such institutions will be billed on an installment basis. At the present time assessments are made payable by the banks at the conclusion of an examination. It is to the advantage of the Comptroller to have the receipt of these funds spread over the year and payable on the installment basis. It is felt that in this way he will be in best position to meet the cost of examinations and other expenses as they occur.

The third change would permit the Comptroller to assess national banks for the cost of an examination for a fee adequate to cover the actual cost thereof. The present law provides that the expense of examining trust deposits shall be assessed against the banks examined in proportion to the total assets. There appears to be no standardization of the practice of banks in respect to carrying the value of the trust assets, and this situation has made the present method

of assessing institutions impractical. Under the proposed legislation, the fee would be based upon the actual cost to the Comptroller's Office of making the trust examination.

Since S. 1188 has been approved by the Treasury Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, it would seem that in the light of its merits and the approval of these agencies it should receive the support of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, S. 1188 was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department. It has passed the Senate and was reported from the House Banking and Currency Committee almost unanimously. It would amend certain provisions of the present law—Revised Statutes 5240, title 12 United States Code, page 881. Under that statute the Comptroller of the Currency is required to examine every national bank at least twice in each calendar year. Examination, of course, may be made oftener if considered necessary.

S. 1188 would provide elasticity to the present requirement by permitting the Comptroller, in his discretion, to waive one such examination in justified cases. However, examinations may not be waived with respect to a particular bank more frequently than once during any 2-year period. Thus, the minimum number of examinations during a 2-year period would be 3 rather than 4 as under the present law.

The experience gained by the Comptroller's Office over a long period of years clearly proves that two examinations is a desirable schedule for a large proportion of national banks. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the present statutory requirement is unnecessarily rigid and not conducive to the best utilization of the time and efforts of the bank examiners. It is not proposed to waive one examination in all possible cases, but rather to adjust examination schedules so as to obtain the maximum benefit from the examination work performed. A large portion of national banks would continue to be examined twice a year.

However, in the case of many adequately capitalized banks with sound asset structures and a long record of capable management of proven ability, it would be safe to omit 1 of the 4 examinations over a 2-year period. The time thus saved would permit the Comptroller's examining staff to be utilized to better advantage by making more thorough examinations generally and devoting additional time to those banks considered to require a somewhat greater than normal degree of supervision.

A change would also be made in the manner of fixing the date on which to have the assessment to cover the expense of the bank examinations. At the present time, the expense of examination of a national bank is assessed by the Comptroller upon the bank examined in proportion to its assets or resources at the date of examination.

This bill would give the Comptroller discretion to make the assessment on any date he may select. In all probability, the assessments would be levied on a quarterly or semiannual basis. The annual rate of assessments would be the same for all national banks. However, banks which are examined more than twice in 1 year would also bear the expense of the special examinations in addition to their regular assessment.

The method of assessing the additional fee required for the examination of trust departments of national banks would be put on a more workable basis. The present law provides that the expense of examining trust departments shall be assessed against the banks examined in proportion to the total assets, and the total bonds or notes outstanding under corporate bond or note issues for which the banks are acting as trustees. Since there is no standardization of practice in respect to carrying the value of trust assets, this provision has proved to be impractical.

Under the proposed legislation, the fee would be based upon the actual cost to the Comptroller's Office of making the trust examination. Included in this cost would be a reasonable amount attributable to overhead expenses of the Comptroller's Office.

S. 1188 has been endorsed by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the bankers of this country speaking through their professional organization, the American Bankers Association. I believe the enactment of this measure is necessary to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the national bank examination program and I therefore, urge a favorable vote upon it.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have always thought that when a Member is voting on a measure in which they might have an interest or some special interest, they should declare it in some way so that it might be a matter of public record. I do not know whether this particular measure will come to a record vote, but if it does, I want to state I happen to be on the boards of directors of two banks, and if there was a record vote, I would vote "present." I have never voted on any measure in which I had a special interest, either for or against, but I have always voted "present." I want to make the record clear in this case that I will not take a position on this legislation due to the fact that I have a modest interest in two small banking institutions, being on their board of directors.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a member of the Banking and Currency Committee it has been my practice to consult the judgment of the bankers of Chicago, from which city I come, on all pending legislation concerning the regulation of banks and

other matters in which those responsible for the proper conduct of banking are interested. I have felt that this is a practice in prudence since it is conceivable that the thinking of bankers in one community might not be similar to the thinking of bankers in other communities because of local customs and conditions.

When S. 1188 and S. 1736 came before our committee 2 questions arose in my mind. First, there was the question as to whether the bankers in Chicago favored the extension from a 50-mile to a 100-mile limitation of the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank, as provided for in S. 1736. At the public hearings before our committee it was stated that the demand for this change largely came from cities in the East. There was no testimony as to the attitude of the bankers in the city from which I come.

Secondly, and more important, was the question of reducing for one classification of banks the number of national bank examinations from 4 to 3 every 2 years while in another classification of banks the inspections would continue to be 4 times in every 2 years. Under the proposal in S. 1188 an estimated 25 percent of the national banks would be examined 4 times in every 2 years and some 75 percent of the banks would be examined only 3 times every 2 years. This raised a question in my mind whether this apparent discrimination could operate to the unjustified disadvantage in the public mind of the banks in the 25 percent category.

So I wrote to all the Chicago banks for an expression of their opinion. I stated that it might be that my concern was baseless but nevertheless I thought I should bring the question to the attention of the bankers in my home city and fortify my position with the recommendations emanating from their wide experience. I did state in my letter that Mr. Gibbs Lyons, President of the National Bank Division of the American Bankers Association, had appeared before our committee in support of both measures.

All of the replies that I received being favorable to both S. 1188 and S. 1736, I gave my support to the action of the Banking and Currency Committee in reporting the bills out.

I am including in my remarks letters from the executives of banks in Chicago, neighborhood banks as well as large banks in the Loop. If there were any danger from what on the surface had appeared to me as a possible discrimination I think it a certainty the bankers who are closest to the situation in the neighborhoods as well as in the downtown area would have discerned it. All who replied to my letter are agreed that beneficial results would attend the passage of these measures and that there would be no unfavorable repercussions.

It must be borne in mind that under existing law when it is believed necessary examinations in addition to those prescribed may be ordered. This is a sufficient safeguard of banking security and stability in unusual situations. I can see no harm in reducing the number of



compulsory examinations when experience has found that they are unnecessary. The letters from the Chicago bankers seem to answer the question of a possible discrimination operating to the disadvantage in the public mind of the banks more frequently investigated.

I am making this report to my colleagues of my correspondence with the bankers of my home city to show how conscientiously not only I but all the members of the Banking and Currency Committee proceeded in our consideration of this proposed legislation. I shall vote for both bills today, as I did in the committee, and I recommend their enactment into law.

Mr. Chairman, I have letters from the presidents of 17 or 18 of the larger and smaller banks in Chicago, all approving this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include these letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The letters from the Chicago bankers follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Upon returning to my desk I find your letter of February 16 which was acknowledged in my absence. I would favor the enactment of both S. 1188 and S. 1736. While I recognize your point about potential discrimination if S. 1188 should become law, I doubt very much that it would work to the disadvantage of the bank that had the full four examinations. Except perhaps in the smaller communities, the public at large is not even aware that an examination is taking place. In addition, the likelihood that the public at large would know that the law had been changed to permit 3 instead of 4 examinations every 2 years, is very remote.

It is encouraging to us in banking to have a Congressman give such careful study to legislative proposals having to do with our business.

With personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

H. J. LIVINGSTON,  
President, the First National Bank  
of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am pleased to give you our thoughts on this pending legislation.

Senate bill 1181, pertaining to examination of national banks, is one which does not directly affect us as a State bank. However, it is our understanding that most banks are in favor of the American Bankers Association support of this bill. We concur in this position.

Senate bill 1736, extending a director's residence from within 50 to within 100 miles of the location of the bank, we believe is not objectionable and think you are justified in voting in favor of it.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our thoughts on this legislation. We believe this is a fine policy to pursue.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH V. ZWIENER,  
President, Harris Trust and Savings  
Bank.

DEAR SIR: In the absence of our chairman of the board, Mr. Lawrence F. Stern, I am very pleased to respond to your letter of February 6, 1956, wherein you invite our comments on legislation for bills S. 1188 and S. 1736. The subjects contained in these two bills have been made a matter of discussion by the management of this bank. We believe that the passing of these bills will operate in the public interest. In the first instance, the Controller of Currency may exercise discretion and concentrate his examinations in

areas which in his judgment require an added degree of supervision. Then, also, the provision to extend the limitations on the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank is fully justified by the modern developments in the transportation industry.

We are very pleased to add our support in favor of passing this legislation.

Cordially yours,

E. W. STEVENS,  
Comptroller, American National  
Bank & Trust Co.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Birdsall is away from the bank temporarily so it is my pleasure to reply to your letter of February 6. I know that Mr. Birdsall would appreciate, as I do, the opportunity to express views on pending legislation before the report of your committee is made.

As a member of the American Bankers Association, our views are expressed through them for the most part. However, we do not see any unfavorable public reaction arising from a greater number of examinations in one bank as against another because it is unlikely that a bank's customers are aware of the timing of examinations. We have always welcomed frequent examination of our bank, but we are sympathetic to the problems of the Comptroller of the Currency and we are happy to abide by the spirit of the proposed legislation.

With respect to an increase in the distance of the resident of an out-of-State director, we feel that the legislation is merited in view of the decentralization of industry and the increased speed of communication that has been achieved in the last 20 years. Undoubtedly, the problem is more acute in the larger cities of the East than it is here in the Midwest. However, the present 50-mile limit for out-of-State directors could very easily deprive Chicago banks of the services as director of very able men residing in nearby areas of either Indiana or Wisconsin.

Yours very truly,

FREDERIC A. CURTIS,  
Comptroller, Continental Illinois  
National Bank.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: When I was on an extended business trip your letter of February 7 seeking my views on S. 1188 and S. 1736 reached my desk. I feel the objectives of both bills are in the public interest, and accordingly endorse them.

Cordially,

J. VINCENT O'NEILL,  
President and Chairman of the Board,  
Mercantile National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In the absence of our president, Mr. Samuel F. Hillman, I am relying to your very kind letter of February 7, 1956. We are honored that you have taken the time to communicate with us as to our position on S. 1188 and S. 1736 and we wish to compliment you for your sincere efforts to get the viewpoint on these bills from members of the bank fraternity.

We have given the question of the provision of S. 1188 due consideration and we feel that it meets with our complete approval. It has been our experience with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency that he has consistently adopted a fair and impartial program for all national banks and we are certain that those banks which will be examined 4 times within each 2-year period will not feel any discrimination but realize that the necessity for such examination exists.

We feel that the provision providing for some banks to be examined only 3 times within a 2-year period will be of great help to the examining staff. We ourselves prefer for our own satisfaction and the protection of our

customers as complete an examination as possible and we recently had the feeling that some examinations were unnecessarily brief and incomplete because of a large backlog of examinations required to be made by the examining staff in the current year. For these reasons we lend our support to this bill.

We are also in agreement with S. 1736. We have felt that the move from the large cities to suburban areas has a tendency to eliminate the selection of competent bank directors since many whom we might take under consideration have their residence beyond the 50-mile limit now provided by the law. In addition, even banks as small as ours, do business beyond our city limits and we might want to attract as a member of our directorate, a businessman living in some surrounding community who banks with us.

We therefore commend to you both of these bills and once more wish to thank you for your very kind consideration in polling our view on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

SEYMOUR BERMAN,  
Executive Vice President, Peoples  
National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Regarding bills S. 1736 and S. 1188 now being discussed by the House Banking and Currency Committee, it is my judgment that they both have merit and are entitled to your favorable consideration.

With reference to the increasing latitude being granted the supervisory department of bank examinations, I am not apprehensive that there may be discrimination alleged by banks that may be subject to more frequent examinations. This could be a constructive factor where management of banks having an inclination to step out of bounds of good banking will be restrained from further speculative tendencies. The classification of assets reflected in the report of examinations should always be an indicator to banks as to what they may expect in the way of visits from the Department.

With reference to the bill regarding qualified directors, I see no objection to increasing the distance from which they may be drawn.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. BEUTEL,  
President, the South East National  
Bank of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Mr. Arthur T. Leonard has requested that I express to you his appreciation for your considerate communication of February 6 pertaining to Senate bills 1188 and 1736.

It is our considered judgment that the discretionary authority vested in the Comptroller of the Currency under S. 1188, whereunder one examination might be waived during a 2-year period, would not operate to an unjustified disadvantage to certain national banking associations. Inasmuch as all national banks will uniformly bear the expense of 2 examinations each year, although only 1 examination may be made, and the need of the Comptroller's examiners for a sufficiency of time to conduct a thorough examination, it is our opinion that the discretionary authority is both constructive and desirable.

With respect to S. 1736, it is our opinion that the decentralization of many large industries from metropolitan centers has necessitated capable and qualified bank directors to transfer their residences to localities beyond the 50-mile area embraced in section 5146 of the Revised Statutes. Accordingly, it is our opinion that Senate bill 1736 embraces progressive legislation.

We are grateful for the opportunity provided by you to express our views on these two important matters.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE MCMAHON,  
Vice President, City National Bank  
of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you very much for writing me under date of February 7 with respect to the upcoming bills affecting banking. I am strongly in favor of both bills being passed. First, with respect to the number of examinations made yearly, the bank examiners are indeed in a better position than anyone to know what banks should be examined 1, 2, or 3 times yearly. Second, I think it would stimulate bankers to better banking to keep in the least examined class. Also, I do not think that the number of examinations is pertinent to the public for they never know whether we have 1, 2, 3 or more examinations a year. Therefore, it is my suggestion that you support this bill.

With respect to S. 1736, I would see no objection to extending the 50-mile limit to 100 miles. In this day of rapid transportation, distance is not too important, and I think some of the men who would be good material for directors have residence over 50 miles away.

Please be assured of my appreciation of your writing me in this connection.

Very truly yours,

ROSWELL O. BYERRUM,  
President, University National Bank.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: This will acknowledge your letter of February 6 addressed to our chairman, John C. Wright, which has been referred to me for reply.

We would urge you to vote for S. 1188 reducing the number of national bank examinations from 4 to 3 in every 2 years. We do not believe the public would be mindful of the fact that some banks would be examined more frequently.

We are also in favor of S. 1736 extending the permissible distance of a director's residence from the location of his bank. We believe this tends to recognize the improved transportation facilities resulting from the growth of residential areas surrounding our metropolitan centers.

We appreciate your interest in writing us regarding these bills.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD MEIDELL,  
President, The LaSalle National Bank.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am pleased to reply to your letter of February 6, addressed to Frank C. Rathje at the Chicago City Bank & Trust Co.

Mr. Rathje is on a world cruise and his associates at the other bank thought that I should answer your letter because S. 1188 is a matter that national banks are particularly concerned with.

I am sure if Mr. Rathje were here, he would advise you that bankers generally favor this bill simply because it is so difficult for the Comptroller to hire enough competent men. He should be given some leeway in the number of examinations. I am also quite sure Mr. Rathje would feel as we do that it is unlikely that the public would ever know how many times any given bank is examined during any 1 year. Since in some years every bank will be examined twice, I doubt that the customers would be aware of any difference.

We have heard very little about extending the distance of the directors' residence from 50 miles to 100 miles from the location of the bank. In talking with Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, he expressed the opinion that the Chicago bankers would probably be in favor of this change.

We are grateful for your interest in calling this matter to Mr. Rathje's attention, but we are sorry he is unable to answer your letter personally.

Yours truly,

HARRY A. FISCHER,  
President, the Mutual National Bank  
of Chicago.

DEAR BARRATT: Was glad to hear from you under date of February 6, with reference to Senate bills S. 1188 and S. 1736.

From your letter I can see that you have given quite a bit of thought to both these bills, especially with reference to S. 1188 with respect to the apparent discrimination that could operate to the unjustified disadvantage in the public mind of the banks in the 25-percent category. I believe that under the law it is always possible for the Comptroller to examine the bank as many times as he sees fit, if in his judgment conditions so warrant, and if the public were alert, seeing examiners around, I can well imagine that it might operate to the disadvantage of the bank. However, from a personal standpoint, I do not believe this has too much effect, and if a bank is conducted along the lines subject to criticism by the Comptroller, there are certain penalties which must be suffered. Personally, I am in favor of S. 1188 and feel that in reducing the number of inspections from 4 to 3 every 2 years, it would permit the examiners to be even more thorough than they are now in the scope of their examinations.

In connection with S. 1736, I believe this is worthy of consideration also, and would certainly approve of the substitution of the words as set forth in the amendment to section 5146.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE R. BOYLES,  
President, Merchant's National Bank  
in Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I hope that you will be able to vote for Senate bill 1188, and it is not of great importance if it is amended to require the Comptroller to make examinations 3 times in each 2 years. If the Comptroller is given discretion, I doubt if there are many hardships that arise out of his discrimination.

Section 2455 now provides that the Comptroller of the Currency shall examine every member bank at least twice in each calendar year and oftener if considered necessary. It appears that the Comptroller should not be prohibited from examining a bank if he thought it necessary to do so for the protection of the depositors.

Senate bill 1736 should be approved since we are having more and more directors living at a greater distance than 50 miles from the banks.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. FREY,  
President, Lake Shore National Bank.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of February 7 in which you have enclosed copies of S. 1188 and S. 1736 being proposed legislation relating to the examination of national banks and to the qualifications of directors, and distance of residence from the location of national banks.

I think both proposals are constructive and join in their endorsement with the committee of the American Bankers Association represented by Mr. Lyons, president of the national-bank division of that association.

Answering your specific question in the second paragraph of your letter, "Could this apparent discrimination operate to the unjustified disadvantage in the public mind of the banks in the 25-percent category?" I would say no. Certainly no more than those banks which can presently be placed on the so-called special lists of examiners. Categorically, the one way to avoid extra examinations is to run a good bank, and I think the proposed legislation is sound.

Your courtesy in writing me is greatly appreciated, and I am glad to see you lending your constructive interest.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

D. H. REIMERS,  
President, The Live Stock National  
Bank of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You are very kind in making available drafts of measures before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and, specifically, S. 1736. I am familiar with the intent thereof, and I appreciate very much indeed your letter soliciting my views thereon.

With respect to S. 1188, it is my judgment that this will be a very salutary thing for the banking industry. I do not feel that banks which will be examined 4 times within 2 years will be subjected to any unjustified disadvantage in the public mind. I should like to see passage of this legislation.

As to S. 1736, the extension from 50 to 100 mile limitation on the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank is not a burning question with Chicago banks or bankers. I would be totally indifferent to the fate of this legislation.

Thanking you for affording me the opportunity of expressing my views, and with kind personal regards, I am

Cordially yours,

PETER I. BUKOWSKI,  
President, The Cosmopolitan National  
Bank of Chicago.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Just returned to my desk and found your letter of February 7. It is good to have a Congressman that works with his constituents.

I think the bill on examinations is good. The reason I feel that it is, is that management in all banks are not alike. Many banks need more examinations in order to make corrections and do away with manipulations, if there are any. I think the Department is the best judge of how banks are managed and in some banks if the examiners never come in they would still run a good bank, while others have to be continually prodded to get away from reckless loaning and the practices that are not sound.

The change on bill S. 1736 limiting the number of miles the majority of the directors can live to the location of the bank, I think is good. Personally, I don't see any difference between 50 and 100 miles as long as the request for three-fourths of the directors live within the 50 or 100 mile radius, they can then have their executive meetings more frequently and once a month that distance is not too far for the majority of directors, who in most instances are executives who can take the time to attend these meetings.

Thanks again for your thoughtfulness in writing the bankers and with best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

WM. V. MCKENZIE,  
President, the Steel City National  
Bank.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of February 7, 1956, with regard to Senate bill No. 1188 has been received, and I am happy to have the opportunity to express my opinion as to the desirability of empowering the Comptroller of the Currency to waive one bank examination in each 2-year period as proposed in this bill.

As a State bank examiner in Illinois 25 and more years ago, I found that some bankers disliked to have their customers know that an examination was in progress and were very sensitive on the matter of frequency of examinations. This, of course, was prior to the great depression and at a



time when bank deposits were not federally insured. The insurance of deposits has done much to establish and maintain confidence in our banking system and about the only question ever raised today is as to whether or not a bank is a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Moreover, rigid supervision by State and Federal banking authorities following the depression, supplemented by examinations made on behalf of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of State nonmember banks, and the insistence of bank supervising authorities generally that periodic examinations be made by or in behalf of the boards of directors of all banks, have caused the public to become more accustomed to bank examiners and they are recognized as everyday citizens with a job to do and are the kind of people that we are happy to introduce to our customers during the course of an examination.

The fact that two examinations are made of our bank each year by national bank examiners and that an examination by certified public accountants in behalf of our board of directors may be made between the national examiners' visits, does not arouse any curiosity or apprehension on the part of our depositors.

In the final analysis, the examination of banks today can be looked upon as an almost continuous process and I do not believe that the waiving of 1 examination in each 2-year period by the Comptroller of the Currency would focus attention on those banks, which, for one reason or another, did not secure the benefit of the waiver.

With regard to the second question in your letter, concerning my reaction to Senate bill 1736 which proposes to extend the limit on the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank to 100 miles (from the present limit of 50 miles), I feel that this change, at the present time, would benefit banks in metropolitan areas on the east coast more than banks in other sections of our country. However, decentralization of population in areas such as Chicago is continuing at such a fast pace that I feel it will not be too long before the provisions of this bill will be helpful in Chicago and other centers of population throughout the country.

I urge your support of both measures.

Very truly yours,

PAUL R. WILKINSON,

President, National Bank of Hyde Park.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has indicated some of the pitfalls that this bill presents. I would like to indicate why I think the bill should be recommitted or, if not recommitted, certainly amended.

We have a very unusual situation presented here. The Comptroller of the Currency came before our committee as did the Chairman of the FDIC and recommended the approval of this bill. Because of prior experience under similar circumstances, I asked the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation whether or not this matter had ever been considered by his Board. I refer now to the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. As you know that Board consists of 3 persons, 2 members, one of whom is the Chairman, and the Comptroller of the Currency. Under the law, not more than two members may be of the same party.

For some years now under this administration the Board of the Federal De-

posit Insurance Corporation has consisted of the Comptroller of the Currency, an appointee of this administration; the Chairman, Mr. Earl Cook, a Republican appointed by this administration; and Mr. Maple T. Harl, a Democrat.

There should be no politics involved in this and I hope there is not. I had learned previously that matters that had been referred to our committee on the letterhead of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation bearing the signature of the Chairman, purporting to be the action of the Corporation and its Board were in fact not the action of the Board but the action of the Chairman acting alone and without having consulted the other members of the Board and without having consulted the Democratic member of the Board.

When these two gentlemen, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of this Board, were before our committee, I asked the Chairman of the Board while he was testifying and while the Comptroller of the Currency was present, whether this recommendation which he was making was his personal recommendation or that of the Corporation.

He replied that it was that of the Corporation. I then asked him if this had been considered by his Board at a Board meeting.

He answered that it had not been formally considered, and there had been no Board action as such, but that he had informally discussed it with the members of the Board.

I then wrote a letter to Mr. Harl, the other member of the Board. I have a copy of that letter before me. It is dated January 26, 1956—after our hearings had closed, unfortunately.

I quote from my letter:

I inquired specifically of Chairman Cook whether or not the recommendation was his personal recommendation or that of the Corporation. Mr. Cook responded that it was the expression of the Corporation. I then asked him whether or not the matter had been discussed in any Board meetings of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and he said it had not been formally discussed at Board meetings, but it had been informally discussed among the Board.

Will you please advise me as to what the facts are with reference to this bill, and any discussions thereof with you formally or informally and, at the same time, whether your views are in accord or contrary to those of Mr. Cook.

I received this significant reply from Mr. Harl dated February 20, 1956:

Replying to your recent letter in which you very thoughtfully enclosed Senate bill 1188 and asked for comments regarding same, please be advised that to the best of my knowledge the board of directors of this corporation has never taken a position regarding its merits. Likewise I have never discussed this proposed legislation with any of the other members of the board of directors.

It is my personal opinion, however, as a result of several years of experience in the supervisory field, that the better the supervision the better the bank; furthermore, vigilance is the price of bank stability and solvency.

I say to this Committee that under these circumstances this bill should be

recommitted or be voted down; it should not be passed. Whether or not it will eventually be adopted I do not know, but I say until those men are called before our committee and explain this discrepancy in the operation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation we should not take action on this bill.

This has been the law now I believe since 1913. There is no immediacy about it; there is no economy involved here. The testimony before our committee is that there is no economy involved here.

Let us review this matter in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 481), is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following sentences: "The Comptroller of the Currency, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall appoint examiners who shall examine every national bank twice in each calendar year, but the Comptroller, in the exercise of his discretion, may waive one such examination or cause such examinations to be made more frequently if considered necessary. The waiver of one such examination as above provided shall not be exercised more frequently than once during each 2-year period beginning January 1, 1955," and by deleting from the second sentence thereof the following: ", or of any other members bank,".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "each 2-year period beginning January 1, 1955" and insert "any 2-year period."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not have time a while ago to develop what I wanted to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I object to the extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's objection comes too late.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency does not want all the light on this he can get.

Mr. SPENCE. I will tell the gentleman if he wants to know.

NO DEBT—NO MONEY

Mr. PATMAN. I am not yielding to the gentleman now. I might yield later.

Mr. Chairman, the capitalistic system is a fine system. It is the greatest system on earth. I believe in it, although it is the debt system. In order for people to have money under the capitalistic system they must go in debt. No debts, no money. Many people argue about the national debt and about paying it off. If you paid off any substantial part of the national debt you would have the most devastating depression we have ever experienced in our history. You must

have debt under the capitalistic system in order to have money. Therefore, the banks perform a very fine, constructive service in creating debt, and I am for that.

I am for the private banking system privately operated. We want to keep it that way. We want to keep a system that is profitable, one that enables them to make money. If they do not make money, they will not be able to stay in business or serve the public well. Therefore, I believe in a profitable private banking system. That is all right. But the point that bothers me in this particular bill is the possibility of favoritism.

The favoritism that I am afraid of is making first- and second-class banks. I do not believe we should leave that power to anyone, particularly a person who is not supervised or audited. And, the Comptroller of the Currency is not under the General Accounting Office. The books, papers, records, policies, and administrative actions of the Comptroller of the Currency are not supervised by the Comptroller General. Therefore, we should not leave this power to a person to act in his own discretion, according to his own will, his likes or dislikes. It is too much power. It is a government of men and not a government of laws. Now, you take, for instance, in the last few months we have had a lot to say about the banking system; it was about trivial matters like this that do not amount to much, here at a time when our Government bonds are going down to 92. They are right now 92. They should not be allowed to sink below par. For 10 years and longer there was a policy in this country that the Open Market Committee would support Government bonds below par. That was a good policy. It saved everybody. It protected everybody who owned bonds. There was no objection to it except from a few banks in this country, and they kept working on it until they finally got that line broken, and Government bonds commenced to go down. They went down in 1953, and then they went up. Some banks bought them low and sold them high and made a profit over the preceding year on the sale of Government securities in 1954 over 1953 of 966 percent. Did you hear that? They made a profit in 1 year by pushing the bonds down, buying them low, and holding them until they went up and selling them. They made \$275 million, a few banks did, and they made a profit of 966 percent over the preceding year. The same thing is taking place now. Bonds are being forced down. They will get into sound hands when they reach the bottom, but I do not know when they will reach the bottom. The people in charge, our money masters, know and the people connected with them know. You and I do not know. But they will buy them at the right time. They will hold them until they go up. Then they will make 966 percent again.

It is the same old racket over and over and over. Now, instead of having fewer examinations it is time when we should have more examinations. And, remember this, that when this bill becomes law,

you will find out that your bank is a second-class bank, because it is required to submit to 4 examinations every 2 years, and the big banks of your State only have to submit to 3 examinations every 2 years. Therefore, the big banks are first-class banks and your bank is a second-class bank. You will probably be asked the reason why. Of course, if we vote for this bill, we will have to say we are responsible for it; we take full responsibility, because we were told by certain people that it is a good thing for the country to allow the Comptroller of the Currency that power, and we granted him that power. Well, it is going to be a sad day for many of us when the banks in the First Congressional District of Texas that I have the honor to represent call me up and say, "Why is it that our banks are second-class banks and the banks in Dallas and Houston are first-class banks?" and when the banks down in Georgia call the distinguished gentleman, Representative Brown, who is a member of this committee, one of the finest Members we have here, a great man, and say "Why is it that our banks down here in this country district are second-class banks? Why do you not make them first-class banks?" Only the Atlanta banks are first-class banks.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia. I know the gentleman would have a good explanation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. My reply to that would be that I was the author of the bill that required the FDIC to make examinations of national banks last year. We passed that amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope that satisfies the gentleman's banks, because I certainly do not want him to get into trouble. I want him to stay here as a Member of Congress. He is a fine Member of Congress. I hope they will not hold this against him. I know that the opposition against him would not be substantial anyway. But what is going to happen down in Kentucky when they begin to call up from Chairman SPENCE's district and say, "What is the matter? Our banks are second-class banks. The banks in Louisville and other places are first-class banks. Why don't you keep our banks first-class? Why do we have to be in a second-class category while the banks in the big cities are first-class?"

That is the kind of thing that is hard to explain. But the chairman is good at explaining things and he will be able to explain it.

And over in Arkansas they will be calling up and asking, "Why is it that only the Little Rock banks are first-class?" Or in Tennessee, "Why is it that only the banks in Memphis and Nashville and Knoxville are first-class banks while other banks are second-class banks?"

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. The Comptroller of the Currency can have additional examinations and charge them to the bank. So it does not change his power at all.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is referring to additional examinations?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. But they are still in the same class.

Mr. SPENCE. These would be additional examinations. This is merely a waiver.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is making my argument. Keep them all in the same class. Keep them all first-class. Then if there are additional examinations required, as the chairman has suggested, they can be made. That is all right. That is well and good. Then we will not have second-class banks and first-class banks. Let us keep them all first-class banks. If you want to change it to 3 examinations every 2 years for all banks with the privilege of making—and they have it and they would have it anyway—of making additional examinations, that is all right if it is justified and I will not oppose it. But here you are giving the Comptroller the power to favor certain banks. And we know which ones he will favor, the big banks, because they can make a better case. But the big banks will be the first-class banks and the little banks will be the second-class banks. Let us keep them all on the same plane, 4 examinations every 2 years for all banks. And if they need additional examinations you can have them. Or if you can make a case for 3 examinations every 2 years, let us have it. I would be for it. But then all banks will be first-class banks. Then if you need additional examinations, you can get them, too. This bill should be recommended. It should be defeated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when I had the floor during general debate, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], asked me to yield, but my time had expired. I am prepared now to yield to him if he desires to have me do so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman wanted this bill recommitted to the committee. Just what reason does he have for recommitting it, just because he wanted another witness to testify?

Mr. MULTER. So that we could bring before us the members of the Board, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and have the Chairman explain to us why he said that he had discussed this matter with the members of the Board, when another member of the Board has put in writing the statement that this bill was never discussed with him formally or informally, and to get his opinion of it on the Record, that this is not a good bill. I think it is important for the committee to get the opinion of the member who was not consulted and who should have been.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The FDIC was summoned to appear and the Chairman did appear. All of the Board did not appear. If the gentleman wanted anybody else to appear, all he had to do was notify the chairman. Sending the bill back to the committee will not change anything. We had all the evidence. Nobody appeared against the bill.



Mr. MULTER. Our distinguished chairman very properly addressed his communication to the Chairman of the FDIC. He came before us. He misrepresented the fact to the committee, saying that he was talking for the Corporation when he was talking for himself. Since that time the other member of the Board has advised me in writing that he was never consulted about this bill. The Chairman of the FDIC owes our committee an explanation as to why this difference of opinion, as to whether this is his personal opinion or that of his Corporation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I think it is too late to ask for an explanation now. It should have been asked for while we were hearing the bill.

The Chairman of the Board came up, after the chairman of this committee had written to him, and testified. You certainly cannot attack evidence of that kind at this late date. If you did, there would be no orderly procedure in the House. Any time somebody could get up and say some man who might have been there was not there and was not consulted. The time to have made that charge was when we were holding hearings on the bill. No such charge was made then. The other member of the Board did not make any charge. It was not proper for him to make the charge to an individual. He ought to have made the charge to the committee that he was not invited to come. We never heard from him. He is a good friend of mine, too, and I think he would not have hesitated to tell me.

Mr. MULTER. The answer to my distinguished chairman, and I hate to differ with him, is that this is the kind of investigation our Committee on Banking and Currency is charged with making. When wrongdoing occurs in any agency the legislation concerning which comes within the jurisdiction of our committee, I say it is the duty of our committee to conduct a full and thorough investigation of the matter, no matter where the complaint comes from. When a respected Government official will put in writing the fact that important legislation was not discussed with him, and the Chairman of his Board says it was, that is enough reason for us to inquire fully into the matter.

I charge that it was reprehensible conduct on the part of the Chairman of the FDIC to misrepresent the facts to us. Responsibility for such misconduct also falls on the Comptroller of the Currency, who silently sat by when the misstatement of fact was made. He, too, knew that the Chairman of FDIC had no right to pretend to be talking for that Corporation at that time. He also knows that that was not the first time the Chairman of FDIC misspoke himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 1, line 9, strike out lines 9 and 10 on page 1 and lines 1 to 7 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the words "three times in every 2 years."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make one class of banks as against what may be first- and second-class banks if the bill is passed as reported.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] did not dream up this expression "first-class banks." If you will read the hearings you will find the person who first used that expression with reference to these banks was the Comptroller of the Currency in trying to describe what he was trying to do by this bill.

Under the law as it exists now, they are required to make 4 examinations in 2 years. If they said, "Let us make this 3 examinations in 2 years," as the distinguished gentleman from Texas says, he has no objection to that, and I think that might be all right. But when the Comptroller of the Currency says, "I am going to continue to charge the banks for 4 examinations every 2 years, but if you give me this bill I will have the right to waive 1 examination in every 2 years as I see fit, and still continue to make the complete charge for 4 examinations," there is not only discrimination by his classifying them as first- and second-class banks but he is also making the bank that gets only 3 examinations pay for 4 examinations every 2 years. One group will pay for 4 examinations and get only 3 examinations. To one group he says, "You are not as good a bank as the bank next door. We cannot waive an examination for you because you are not as good or as strong as the other bank." That is the vice in the bill now before us.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I stated I would favor three if justification were shown, but, of course, justification has not been shown for three examinations of all banks. Therefore, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his amendment. Let us do what he has said before should be done—recommit the bill. Then, we can have hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. If they can show a justification for three examinations a year, and keep all banks as first-class banks, I will favor it. But, I want the justification to be shown. As it is now, it shows the opposite.

Mr. MULTER. There is not any doubt but that the gentleman is right in saying that no justification has been shown. I spent considerable time in the hearings trying to get the Deputy Comptroller and the Comptroller and the Chairman of the FDIC to tell us what standard he will use in order to determine when he will waive an examination. We know what standards he uses when he decides to have an additional examination—he has reason to believe something is wrong in the practice of the bank; the bank may be unsound or it may be making

bad loans. He uses indicia such as that in his scheme of standards to decide whether to make an additional examination. What standards will he use to determine when he will waive examinations? Now, there is page after page after page of hearings, but we could get nothing from any of these distinguished gentlemen who should know this subject, and know what they are doing, particularly, with reference to the examination of banks. We could not get a word from them to indicate what standards they would use. Under this bill they will arbitrarily say to bank No. 1 in city A, "You are all right—three examinations." To the bank next door they will say: "You are no good. We are going to give you four examinations."

That is the vice of this bill as it comes to us. If you want to pass the bill at all, then let us put all of these banks on the same plane. Let us keep them on the same plane and let us give them the same rights. If you only want 3 examinations in 2 years, give all of them 3 examinations. The right, of course, will still continue in the law permitting the Comptroller or the FDIC or the Federal Reserve Board or the State superintendent of banks, if he has the authority to go in, to conduct an additional examination when they want it. But let us not say: Every bank gets 4 examinations every 2 years except, when for some unknown reason and without any standards the Comptroller of the Currency says to his favorite or his friend, "You get only three." I hope you will adopt the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the years the national banks have been examined 4 times every 2 years—that is in the law. Those who are charged with that duty believe that it will continue to be necessary to examine a large proportion of these banks twice a year. That is the way this bill was drawn. If that is their opinion and if that is their experience that 4 examinations are usually necessary and we only authorize 3 examinations, then there will be a great number of extra examinations, and if each one of those examinations is a reproach to the bank—if each extra examination will make people believe a certain bank is not as stable and as sound as the banks that have not had that examination, then this is the best amendment in the world to create a distinction between banks—a distinction which is not created by the bill as introduced, which is the result of the experience of those who have charge of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The third paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482), is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "The expense of the examinations herein provided for shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency upon national banks in proportion to their

assets or resources. The assessments may be made more frequently than annually at the discretion of the Comptroller of the Currency. The annual rate of such assessment shall be the same for all national banks, except that banks examined more frequently than twice in 1 calendar year shall, in addition, be assessed the expense of these additional examinations."

#### TWO CLASSES OF BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to remind the Members that if they succeed in amending this law so that first-class banks will be examined only 3 times a year and second-class banks will be examined 4 times a year, assessments will be the same. There is no difference in the money that will be provided or the assessments. It is strictly a question of allowing one person, according to his likes or dislikes, his good reasons or no reasons, to grant a special favor, or to indulge in favoritism between banks. I am not claiming that the present Comptroller of the Currency will do that. I am sure he does not have that in mind, but I can see in a case like Covington, Ky., for instance, the town represented by the distinguished chairman of this committee, a great statesman and a great chairman of the committee, if he succeeds in getting this bill passed and it becomes law, the banker at Covington will call him up and say "Why don't you get us classified 1-A, just as good as a dairy out here in the country, or like the Cincinnati banks?" The Cincinnati banks and the Louisville banks are first-class. They will say "Why can't ours be first-class?"

The chairman will be powerless to do that, because the Comptroller of the Currency is not going to be pressured into doing something. He acts according to his own good judgment.

This is a dangerous bill. It does not save anybody a penny. It does not save the Government any money. It does not save the banks any money. It does only one thing, it permits one person who has no supervision of any kind whatsoever to grant favoritism between banks, and make first-class banks out of big banks and second-class banks out of the smaller ones.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

This matter of examination of national banks goes back to 1863. At that time it was agreed that some banks might need more examinations than two per year. So, if favoritism arises out of the number of examinations, the practice dates back to the origin of the National Bank Act because the provision was made then for special examinations. If there are classes of banks, they are classes which are made by the banks themselves because of the manner in which they manage their operations.

Years ago, a distinguished public servant who was Comptroller of the Currency or Deputy Comptroller for as long as 30 years wrote a book called "The Romance and Tragedy of Banking." Anyone who reads that book will find that the principal reason for the failure of banks is poor management. Human beings are not endowed with equal man-

agerial talents. I doubt that those who oppose this bill would be able by law to guarantee the same class of management in every one of our banks. If they could do that, then there would be some point to the opposition argument. This bill does not establish any classification of banks whatever. What it does do is to conserve the time of the work force, the corps of examiners, so that they can be employed profitably where they should be employed, in the examination of some banks that need further examination because the management is less good than in other banks.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The seventh paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482) is deleted and there is substituted therefor the following: "In addition to the expense of examination to be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency as heretofore provided, all national banks exercising fiduciary powers and all banks or trust companies in the District of Columbia exercising fiduciary powers shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency for the examination of their fiduciary activities a fee adequate to cover the expense thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, pursuant to House Resolution 429, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to recommit the bill S. 1188 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 3, noes 15.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1736, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Although this bill comes with a unanimous report from the Committee, I anticipate that there may be opposition to its passage. It has but one purpose, and that is to enlarge the territory of the residences from which directors of national banks may be drawn.

Under existing law 75 percent of the directors must live within the State or within 50 miles of the bank. The other 25 percent may live anywhere.

This bill would reduce the number of directors from three-fourths to two-thirds who must live within a prescribed distance of the bank and increase that distance from 50 to 100 miles. Under this provision banking associations might frequently be able to obtain directors who are desirable whom they otherwise could not obtain. A bank's reputation largely depends upon the character of its directors. A fine directorate gives strength and character to the bank. It is essential that banks should have directors in whom the people have confidence. Great advances in transportation and improvements in our roads have changed the character of the residence of our people. The great mansions of the rich men of generations ago have now gone into decay as these men establish their homes in the suburbs and at more distant places. It is not unusual in this age



for one to live 60 or 70 miles or more from his business.

The bill was passed by the Senate without objection and without much debate. The Comptroller of the Currency wants this provision enacted in the law. The Federal Reserve is in favor of it. The American Bankers Association wants it and the banks want it. The bill is asked for by those who have had experience, and we feel that it may give strength to the banks and confidence to the patrons.

I think it is desirable to pass the bill.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, like the preceding bill which was just passed by the House, is a good one. It is simple; nothing earth-shaking about it. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has stated the case correctly and well. It is an attempt to be realistic. A lot of improvement in communication and transportation has occurred since the National Bank Act was written near the middle of the last century. This bill is realistic in its outlook, and it will make for stronger bank boards of directors.

Mr. Chairman, there is great variation among the States as to residence requirements for directors of State bank boards. There are 18 States that do not have any residence requirements at all.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in my taking further time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### LOOPHOLE IN BANK ANTIHOLDING COMPANY ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is another innocent-appearing bill. When the distinguished chairman of our committee devoted so much time and effort to an antiholding company bill, I was working with him 100 percent. I thought he was right, and he was right. He did a wonderful service in getting the Committee on Banking and Currency to pass an antiholding company bill which was an antiabsentee ownership of banks. That is what it was, antiabsentee ownership. And, believing in local ownership as much as possible, I was one of his principal supporters; in fact, I had introduced a bill, in years gone by, myself. It is a fine bill. All right. That bill passed the House by a good vote. It went to the Senate, and it will soon be out of the Senate, I hope.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I just wanted to thank the gentleman for the kind sentiment he expressed about me in regard to the antiholding company bill. That is the first time he has been right today, I think.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I have been right a lot of times, and the gentleman is wrong as well as right a lot of times. This is the second time the gentleman has been wrong today. This holding company bill will be out pretty soon. Think about how ridiculous we are if we put a loophole in the law before it passes. This will be a loophole in the antihold-

ing company bill big enough for a Cadillac car to go through. It will not destroy the antiholding company bill, but it will be a big loophole in it. It is going in the opposite direction. In the antiholding company bill we are saying we are for local ownership; we are against absentee ownership of banks. This bill says a director can live as far away as 100 miles. What does that mean? That means a person can live halfway between Philadelphia and New York and be a director of New York banks and Philadelphia banks and all the important cities on the eastern coast. Instead of this being for local ownership as against absentee ownership, it is in the direction of absentee ownership. It is going in the opposite direction.

Now, I will admit this is not an earth-shaking bill, as the gentleman from Iowa mentioned a while ago; it is not, and I shall not insist on any rollcall on it or make any point of no quorum. It is not a question that is so great as that. But, it seems to me just a little bit ridiculous for us to be taking up questions like this, making loopholes in laws before they are actually enacted into law, and so small in comparison to the big problems that are before us today that are not receiving any consideration at all.

#### MAJOR PROBLEMS

You take, for instance, the veterans are now being forced to take a 10 percent discount on many of their mortgages that are guaranteed 100 percent by the United States Government. If there ever was a shame and a disgrace, that is one, yet we will take up our time on bills like this and not say a word about these money sharks forcing the veterans to take a 10 percent discount on mortgages guaranteed by the United States Government; just as good as United States Government bonds; going on all the time, every day. We are not turning our hands on it. Another thing: Government bonds are going down. They will soon be down to 90. Why, that is terrible. And yet here we are taking up our time on things like this and paying no attention to the other at all, letting it go. We can support those Government bonds. This Congress can require the proper authorities to do it and it would not cost the Government one penny. It would not cost anybody a penny. We could keep them at 100 percent and keep our economy sound. Yet we do not do it; we do not pay any attention to it. That is not a problem we are concerned about. We take up our time with bills like this.

Another thing: Interest rates are being arbitrarily raised. If there was ever a scandal on earth, there was one the other day. That was the unnecessary increase in interest rates. It was said that it was needed on account of the danger of inflation. Where are the dangers of inflation? They are not on the farm, not among the small-business men, not among the home builders of America. There is no inflation there. Where is it? But let us assume for the sake of argument that there are dangers of inflation. Why do we have to raise interest rates in order to deal with them? They can raise reserve requirements of banks and do exactly the same thing. But that

would not raise interest rates. Why do they not do that? That poses a serious question for Congress to answer. Why should we take up our time on little things like this that do not amount to a thing in the world in the overall economy of the country and let major things like that go on?

Down in Texas we used to have a bank robbery now and then. Of course, any bank robbery is bad, but when people ride in on horseback in the middle of the day and go in and rob a bank and get away with it, the people in other towns criticize them—the local residents and businessmen—and say, "Why in the world did you let them get by with it, come in there and rob your bank in broad daylight?"

#### ROB US IN BROAD DAYLIGHT

But that is what we are permitting them to do here. As Members of Congress we are letting them rob us in broad daylight. We are letting them rob the veterans of 10 percent of their guaranteed mortgages. We are letting them arbitrarily raise interest rates. We are letting them force Government Bonds to go down to 90. And here we are doing nothing about it. We are just letting them rob us in broad daylight and doing nothing about it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Texas is a great student of money matters. I was wondering if he was going to make any comment on the raising of the discount rate by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. I put a statement on that in the RECORD yesterday. I hope the gentleman will read it. That was cruel, absolutely unnecessary. Anyone who understands the problem at all knows that. Why should they raise interest rates? What excuse can they give? Inflation. Where is it? As I said a while ago, it is not on the farm, it is not among the small-business men; they are going broke. It is not among the home builders. Where is the inflation? That is the excuse they give. All right; let us say again, for the sake of argument, that their apprehensions and fears are justified. They do not have to raise interest rates to meet that threat of inflation. They can get the same results without raising interest rates by increasing the reserve requirements of banks.

What I deplore is the fact that we take up our time on bills like this when there are real earth-shaking problems, I will say to the gentleman, before our eyes here in broad daylight that we do not touch, say nothing about, and to which we give no consideration.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1736. This bill was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department to amend the residence requirement for directors of national banking associations. The present law—Revised Statute, section

5146; title 12, United States Code, section 72—requires that at least three-fourths of the directors must have resided in the State, Territory, or district in which the association is located, or within 50 miles of the association's office, for at least 1 year immediately preceding their election as directors. Furthermore, three-fourths of the directors must continue to maintain such residence during their term in office.

The present law would be changed in two respects by S. 1736. The number of directors subject to the residence requirement would be reduced from three-fourths to two-thirds and the 50-mile limitation would be increased to a 100-mile limitation. Consequently, under this bill at least two-thirds of the directors would be required to maintain a residence within the State or within 100 miles of the bank's office.

The purpose of these amendments is to give national banks a wider range in the selection of their directors. The shareholders of national banks are desirous of electing strong boards of directors and, in some instances, the present law has proven unduly restrictive. The new 100-mile limitation gives recognition to the advances in transportation that have occurred since the 50-mile limitation was adopted in 1921. Today a director residing 100 miles from the bank would be as available to discharge his duties as would a director who resided 50 miles away at the time of enactment of the present law.

I have heard of no objections to the amendments and I believe that these minor changes will be beneficial to the national banking system.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, under the law, boards of directors of national banks must consist of not less than 5 members nor more than 25, so this proposed change in the residence requirement is genuinely minor; but it does mean something to some banks. If we will take into account the changes that have taken place here in the Washington area within the last 15 or 20 years and consider how much farther away from the Capital Members live now than formerly, we can visualize very easily why we should not restrict a bank director from living as far away from the bank as say 100 miles. This bill is realistic and should be passed.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 12, sec. 72), is amended by deleting therefrom the words "three-fourths," "fifty" and "fifty-mile," and substituting therefor the words "two-thirds," "one hundred" and "one-hundred-mile," respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of

the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations, pursuant to House Resolution 430, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file the 15th intermediate report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### RESOLUTION ON GATT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution that provides for an investigation and study by the Committee on Ways and Means of certain aspects of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—and its relation to the proposed new Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD House Resolution 459.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 459

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of:

(1) The legislative authority for negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), signed for the United States by the Department of State on October 30, 1947, in Geneva, Switzerland;

(2) The source of authority for each of the 35 articles of the same agreement (GATT), to determine—

(a) whether the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, was the sole authority for the negotiation of each article, and if so

(1) what doctrine of delegation of powers from the legislative to the executive was relied upon to justify negotiation of the so-called trade rules or the substantive provisions of the agreement; while if not

(11) what other legislative or nonlegislative sources of authority were invoked to justify negotiation of each article authority for which was not found in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended;

(3) The power of self-amendment contained in article XXX of said agreement (GATT), in order to determine the extent to

which the contracting parties thereof may themselves, independently of any restrictions on the powers of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation, amend the existing agreement toward the enlargement of its scope and jurisdiction without further reference to Congress;

(4) What barriers, if any, would approval of the articles of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation create against the recapture and retention by Congress of its power to regulate foreign commerce in view of—

(a) the renunciation of import quotas under article XI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which would be administered by said Organization;

(b) the power of self-amendment conferred upon the contracting parties of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) under article XXX, referred to in paragraph (3) hereof;

(c) the practice of the contracting parties of the said general agreement to agree to the binding of tariff rates at specified levels and the freezing of items on the free list;

(5) The status of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should the Organization for Trade Cooperation be established, to determine the extent to which the said general agreement could be carried out independently of any reservations attached to membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation by any member; and the extent to which any such reservations must be compensated by concessions to other member nations and the extent to which the necessary waivers by other members permitting such reservations might be merely temporary and subject to withdrawal;

(6) The extent to which the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade operate toward the binding of a future Congress against the exercise of its constitutional authority to determine the policies that are to govern our foreign trade and the level of our import duties, by action of a preceding Congress or by action of the President in exercising the powers delegated to him in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, or otherwise;

(7) The extent to which the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are in conflict with the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (that is, the so-called escape clause); with section 8 of the same act (that is, amendment to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act); with the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 (that is, the so-called national security provision); the American selling price and other valuation provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930; the Anti-Dumping Act; the Buy American Act; the cargo preference law (that is, the 50-50 preference for American merchant shipping); the mixing regulations of the Rubber Act of 1948; with export subsidies, and to what extent, if any, membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would deter or bar action by the United States Government toward the enforcement of these statutes;

(8) The source of the presumed or assumed power of the contracting parties of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade under which they have acted to grant a waiver to the United States to continue in effect import quotas on various agricultural products established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, including an examination of the doctrine of delegation of power by which the said contracting parties became possessed of sufficient authority to come into a position of granting such a waiver;

(9) The meaning of the stated objectives and purposes of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade insofar as they may conflict, upon implementation, with the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate



foreign commerce and to establish and adjust tariff rates; and the extent to which the Organization for Trade Cooperation, if established, would operate to carry into effect such objectives and purposes.

(10) The extent to which approval by the Congress of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would ratify the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and thus nullify the congressional caveat adopted in various Trade Agreements Extension Acts.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the need for such a study became apparent during the hearings conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means during March on H. R. 5550, which is the bill that calls for United States membership in the OTC.

The question naturally arose what kind of an organization we are being asked to get into. This question could not be answered either by looking at the bill, H. R. 5550, nor by reading the articles of agreement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The bill itself proposed nothing more than membership in the OTC and something about appropriations to pay a part of its expenses. Obviously that told us nothing or very little of what we needed to know. The articles of agreement on the OTC, to be sure, gave more details, but only enough to leave a gaping hole in the information that is needed.

Obviously if the United States is about to enter another international organization we who are asked to approve the step owe it to ourselves and to the people we represent to know what will be the powers of that organization and just where Congress itself will stand if we do become a member.

The resolution accordingly asks for an investigation of the legislative authority under which the State Department negotiated the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947, since that is what the OTC would administer. It asks further that the legislative authority for negotiation of each of the 35 articles of the general agreement—GATT—be ascertained.

This information is essential for any member who seeks to vote intelligently on H. R. 5550, for two reasons:

First. The source of authority for negotiation of the general agreement—GATT—is under dispute. The State Department itself has been inconsistent in explaining the source of its authority.

In one instance—that is, before the Senate Finance Committee in 1949—it said that the President's authority did not rest solely on the Trade Agreements Act but that the President had some undefined general authority to make international trade agreements. Fifteen of the 35 articles of the general agreement—GATT—were attributed to this general authority and the remainder to the authority contained in the Trade Agreements Act.

In other instances the State Department has held that the Trade Agreements Act itself delegated ample authority to the President to enable the State Department, acting for the President, to negotiate GATT, including the substantive provisions, such as the one against the establishment and maintenance of import quotas. This was the position the Department took before the Senate Finance Committee in 1955 and before the Ways and Means Committee in 1956.

Which is the correct interpretation, if, indeed, either one of the two explanations is correct?

Many of us, on the contrary, believe that the State Department greatly exceeded its authority when it negotiated the General Agreement in Geneva 8 years ago. We believe that the State Department representatives ran wild and paid little attention to the source of their authority. They began to explain only after they were challenged by Congress. Their first explanation, already mentioned, was that more than the Trade Agreements Act was drawn upon, namely, the general authority of the President to conduct foreign affairs.

This turned out later to be too vague an explanation and not a satisfactory source of power, particularly since a Supreme Court decision on the inherent authority of the President, and the State Department shifted to the more recent position, which, to repeat, was that the Trade Agreements Act itself gave the President adequate authority. The American Bar Association, among others, does not agree with such an interpretation. It says that the OTC would be unconstitutional.

What are Members of Congress to think of such varying interpretations of the power delegated to the President?

Such questions should be answered before we are asked to vote on the OTC.

This brings us to reason No. 2 why the legislative authority to negotiate GATT should be studied thoroughly before Congress is asked to approve the OTC:

Second. Approval of the OTC would also represent approval of the general agreement, for the simple reason that the OTC would administer GATT and would be set up to give full effect to the purposes and objectives of GATT. This is set forth clearly in articles 1 and 3 of the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC.

This is very important. If Congress is to approve GATT, even if only by the back door, we should know what kind of a house we are entering.

But this is not in accordance with the State Department design. If we took a good look at GATT we might not want to go into the house by either

the back or the front door. That is why the State Department devised this roundabout way of getting congressional approval of GATT. It was afraid to submit GATT itself for approval.

Many of these objections came to light in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and that committee tried hard to meet the objections.

I am sorry to say that the amendments adopted by the committee, no matter how well-intentioned—and I believe that they were designed honestly to meet the most serious objections—nevertheless do not hit the spot. The fact is that they could not overcome the objections so long as GATT itself was not before the committee for approval or disapproval.

Paragraph 3 of the resolution calls for an investigation of the power of self-amendment contained in article XXX of GATT. There is very good reason for looking into that, as I hope you will see. That power, that is, GATT's power of self-amendment, has been exercised in the past; and in no case, let me emphasize, in no case have such amendments come to Congress for acceptance or rejection. And right here let me point out, let me make it clear beyond doubt, that nothing contained in the Ways and Means Committee amendments to the OTC bill would modify or restrict this power of GATT to amend itself.

It does no good, it does not go to the heart of the matter, to throw a halter on the OTC or to hobble its range here and there by amendments. The central reservoir of power lies in GATT, regardless of its source, and amendments to the OTC do not reach it. GATT can amend itself. Remember that. GATT can amend itself, and the OTC could not stop it. Should it do so, the OTC, once established, would simply administer the GATT in its amended form.

The committee amendments of the OTC bill do little or nothing to keep GATT itself in bounds; and we are well aware how free GATT has been in setting itself up as the supreme arbiter over our tariff and trade policies. Considering how far and how fast the State Department has moved with GATT never approved by Congress, we can only guess what notions it would put into effect if Congress approved the OTC and thus assured GATT that the reins guiding it had been relinquished into its own hands.

The ink of the President's signature approving OTC would hardly be dry before the State Department would begin to reinforce its already systematic method of ignoring Congress in matters of tariffs and trade. Congress would no longer have any hold over the regulation of our foreign commerce; only a shadow, a theory would remain, but nothing in reality. The so-called right to legislate left to us in this field would have no more substance than a cobweb; and that is exactly what would be spun around our authority and responsibility very soon after approval of the OTC.

These are some of the questions that the resolution seeks light on. These are some of the problems that loom before us in considering the OTC. There are more, many more, and still more would

soon come to light, particularly in dealing with the farm problem, if OTC were accepted. The question of disposal of farm surpluses runs squarely into our commitments under GATT. The question of establishing import quotas on farm products and keeping them in effect is also tangled up in GATT. Shall we confirm the powers of GATT without knowing what they are?

I say first let us find out how far down the river the State Department has already carried us before we extend another accession of power, much less virtually a blank check, such as OTC approval would amount to. As far as I am concerned the Department has not earned our confidence in this field. It has grabbed for power and then when challenged has turned around and claimed this power as a matter of right. Now it asks for still more power. I cannot consent to it.

This all calls for close examination. That is the purpose of the resolution. Let us stand firm in our purpose to get more information. If we fail to get the facts, we should, in the interest of our economic security and the safety of the Republic, defeat this un-American proposal.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty accord with the resolution calling on the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct a full investigation and study of various aspects of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, usually referred to as GATT.

The purpose of this resolution is not to call into question the competence, industry, or integrity of the Committee on Ways and Means for which I have the highest regard.

It is for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the shortcomings of H. R. 5550 which is the bill on which the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings during the month just past and which proposes membership of the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC.

H. R. 5550 as introduced was a very simple bill and very short. It was amended in committee in what was no doubt an attempt to overcome some of the serious defects of the original bill as revealed in the hearings.

Unfortunately the amendments also fall short of curing the shortcomings of the bill.

For this there is a very good reason.

The bill, H. R. 5550, did not call for an examination of the long and complex and highly controversial articles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; and the committee therefore was without benefit of having before it the substance of the very thing it was asked to act upon. The difficulty of reaching a conclusive judgment on the OTC under such circumstances is not difficult to understand.

What was before the committee was a proposal for membership of the United

States in an international organization. That was about all there was to it. And that is what this House will no doubt soon have before it. The question will ostensibly be, "Do we wish to join an international organization that will administer and carry out the provisions of an international agreement?"

If this sounds odd, the blame must fall on H. R. 5550.

The question is indeed made to appear quite simple. Every member should be able to make up his mind whether he wishes the United States to take out membership in an organization dedicated to the implementation of an international agreement.

It would in fact be quite simple, unless a member should make so bold as to ask, "What's in this agreement that we are asked to vote for?"

The answer to that would also seem to be simple. Congress is not being asked to vote on an agreement. It is asked simply to give its O. K. to membership in an organization that would administer and carry out a certain agreement, namely, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). It is asked to vote only on the organizational features and not the substance; but in so doing would in reality be passing on the substance as well.

Unfortunately for the success of such a maneuver, some of us want to know what is in the agreement before we decide whether we want the United States to join an international body set up specifically to carry out that agreement. We do not relish giving our consent without knowing what it is that we are consenting to.

It is true that in the public hearings on H. R. 5550 many references were made to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, but the committee was under no obligation to inquire into it in detail. The hearings developed a great diversity of opinion on the meaning of the OTC in its relation to GATT. For example, the American Bar Association, among others, strongly opposed H. R. 5550 on the grounds that it would be unconstitutional. Other witnesses, on the other hand, said there could be no question about its constitutionality.

The hearing probably raised more questions than it settled; and the committee adopted a number of amendments that were apparently designed to meet at least some of the objections of the opponents; but as I have said previously these amendments could not reach the heart of the matter because the Ways and Means Committee obviously could not amend the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as distinguished from restrictions on our membership in the OTC itself. Nor was the committee in a position to lay down limitations to the conditions under which the United States participates in GATT as a contracting party. It could not do this, first, because the GATT was not before the committee; and, secondly, because GATT provides its own mechanism for its amendment and the Congress of the United States does not figure in that mechanism.

In other words, the Ways and Means Committee was all but acting in a

vacuum, so far as doing anything to guide our participation in GATT was concerned. This was unfortunate if not deliberate because the Congress has not had an opportunity to vote approval or disapproval of GATT. This looked like a good opportunity but GATT was not brought before the Congress in H. R. 5550.

On the other hand, while the committee was thus helpless toward GATT, it was nevertheless in a position to give GATT a green light. This was the case because of the nature of the carefully designed wording of the bill. Without authorizing Congress to examine GATT, the bill, if passed, would nevertheless represent congressional approval of GATT.

This follows from the logic of the case. If we approve membership in an international organization that is set up specifically to administer and carry out a named agreement, only by tortured logic could it be held that we did not approve of the contents of the agreement. Such a course would be completely irrational and cannot be accepted as the intent of Congress.

The fact is that approval of the OTC would everywhere be construed, and properly so, as ratification of the GATT. And this would be accomplished without Congress necessarily knowing what GATT is.

That is why GATT itself should be brought before Congress; and that is what the present resolution proposes. It would give the Ways and Means Committee an opportunity to inquire, first, into the intended or probable relationship between OTC and GATT; second, into the position of Congress alongside of an approved GATT, in view of the extensive authority exercised by GATT over our tariff and trade policies; third, into the probable loss of its constitutional power to regulate foreign commerce by Congress under such circumstances and the gravitation of this authority into the hands of OTC-GATT; and fourth, into many other questions that were left dangling because of the limitations on the hearings on the OTC.

There is so much hidden in the operation of GATT, so much controversy over the powers it exercises and so much concern over its replacement of Congress as the regulator of our foreign commerce that it needs a thorough going over before we go ahead with the OTC. One of the greatest elements of danger in endorsing GATT, as we would be doing if we approved the OTC, lies in the weapon of coercion that this would place in the hands of the Executive by which a dissenting Congress could be driven into line.

Those who argue that the State Department could not coerce the Congress through the instrumentality of an international trade agreement have evidently not followed closely what has already been done under GATT. Import quotas, for example, have been renounced, except under circumstances that have only limited application to the United States.

This renunciation has given the executive a powerful weapon that can be used



effectively to thwart any effort in Congress to pass contrary legislation. It would be said, as it has been said already, that Congress in legislating contrary to a trade agreement would violate our international commitments and thus defame and besmirch the good name of Uncle Sam before the world. Moreover, our friends, the free nations of the world, would be dismayed and discouraged and would become embittered over what would appear to be the irresponsibility and instability of Congress.

Such arguments, made possible only because the State Department had gone beyond its power in binding the United States to a given course of action in tariff and trade matters, could intimidate Congress in a manner that would not be possible if the State Department were prevented from venturing out of bounds in the first place.

Only by studying the various aspects of the powers delegated to the President in the Trade Agreements Act, the manner in which these powers were used by the State Department in negotiating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the interrelation between the proposed OTC and GATT, can Congress hope to deal properly with the question of whether the United States should become a member of the OTC.

I strongly urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to that of the other Members who have preceded me in endorsing the resolution calling for a study and investigation of GATT before we are asked to vote on OTC membership as provided in H. R. 5550.

Mr. Speaker, my State, too, would be affected by our membership in the OTC. Maine has a textile industry that faces destructive import competition. It has paper mills, shoe factories, plants that make spring clothespins, sardine fisheries and canneries. It supplies lobsters and potatoes far beyond its own borders.

These are all products that experience import competition. The regulation of such competition so that these industries and their workers may carry on their operations with reasonable profits and scales of pay is of the utmost importance to them. Tariff and trade legislation affects them directly and substantially. My interest in such legislation therefore needs no further justification.

My interest in the resolution arises from its search for more information. The Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the OTC. I testified before the committee and no doubt the hearings produced much important evidence. But like many others, I do doubt whether because of the limitations on the hearings, they produced the kind of information that we need most in order to vote properly on H. R. 5550.

The defect of the hearings lay in the fact that they were addressed to the OTC and not to the core of the whole question that we must really decide, namely, the scope, the powers, the meaning and the status of GATT; but more particularly the relation of OTC-

GATT to Congress, should OTC be adopted.

How far would approval of the OTC by Congress be interpreted as representing simultaneous approval of GATT? How far would approval of the OTC represent confirmation by Congress of GATT actions during the past 8 years?

How familiar is Congress with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT? How familiar are the Members of this body with the origin of GATT; its makeup, its trade rules, its manner of operation, its purposes and objectives, its assertion or assumption of jurisdiction over trade and tariff questions and its manner of amending itself? This could be an embarrassing question.

Since the State Department has never been under obligation to report to Congress on GATT operations and since the articles of agreement have never been submitted to Congress, it would not be surprising if the membership of this House were a little on the deficient side in their knowledge of this very important subject.

GATT has held 10 annual sessions. It has built up a somewhat voluminous record of decisions and a yet larger one on interpretations and protocols. Its tentacles of power have been extended into many areas and nooks that may not have been contemplated at the outset.

The OTC would give the members of GATT an assembly. This indicates the direction of GATT ambitions, for while the OTC is described as little more than an administrative agency to carry out the provisions of GATT, the creation of an assembly must contemplate rule-making or amendment and modification of the present agreement. Assemblies are not usually set up as compliance machinery.

None of this is set forth in H. R. 5550, which is a very short bill.

There is so much at stake here, so much that needs to be brought out into the open and so much that needs interpretation that it seems odd that GATT was not submitted to the Ways and Means Committee for full examination along with the OTC itself. Failing this, the call for hearings on H. R. 5550 should have included an inquiry into the many highly significant questions about GATT that must have occurred to many Members since the negotiation of that agreement.

What powers did Congress really intend to place in the hands of the President when it passed the Trade Agreements Act and subsequently extended it? Does Congress now agree that the Department has wisely used these powers?

Or better yet, would Congress agree, if it knew all the facts, many facts that are not now before it, that the State Department has stayed within the grant of power contained in the Trade Agreements Acts?

It might be asked whether it is the fault of Congress itself that it knows so little about GATT. There may be some room for entertaining such a possibility. If so, that is all the more reason why we should now remedy any such failure.

Keep in mind that Congress receives no reports on GATT and that the President was under no mandate to keep Congress informed.

That, however, is water under the bridge and in no sense would excuse any further complacency toward our responsibility in this field, expressly fixed by the Constitution. We are now at a most crucial point in the history of this delegation of power. Either Congress shoulders its responsibility and is true to its duty or it forfeits its authority and lets down its constituency, that is, the electorate and the citizens it represents.

Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming the Ways and Means Committee. I think if it had it to do over again it would call a hearing on GATT. Nor am I blaming Congress for knowing so little about GATT, for in doing so I would also be blaming myself. I do, however, feel that from here on we would fall far short of our responsibility if we did not make up for the lack of information on GATT from which we suffer.

There is no question in my mind that we would be committing an unpardonable omission, in fact an evasion of duty, if we undertook to act on OTC without first informing ourselves on some of the questions that I have raised. These questions need answering and we cannot be indifferent to them. There are other questions that need answering before we vote on this issue. Many of them have been raised by other speakers on the resolution. I join with them in their concern and ask that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the glass industry and the ceramic tile industry in the district which I have the privilege to represent—both employees and management—have expressed themselves in regard to the proposed organization for trade cooperation. These people are deeply concerned because they find themselves in increasing competition with cheap foreign imports.

For this reason, I would like to add my voice to those who are in favor of the complete study of GATT before final action is taken on the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation.

OTC, as that organization is called, has been billed as a powerless organization which would not affect the authority of Congress over the control of foreign commerce.

Nothing could be more misleading, OTC would be an international assembly whose power would be defined by two documents which give it its jurisdiction. One of these is the OTC agreement, and the other is GATT.

GATT is a solemn agreement which has been entered into by the United States and 34 other nations. Its provisions are concerned with defining the policies which its members will follow in the conduct of international trade.

If Congress authorizes the executive department to commit the United States to membership in OTC, its action can have only one meaning. This would be

that Congress is willing to give up part of the sovereign power of the United States to determine for itself what policies it will follow in the realm of international trade.

Let me explain how this could be the only meaning of congressional approval of OTC.

First, each of OTC's members, including the United States, would previously have signed GATT.

Second, GATT, as I have said, is nothing more and nothing less than an elaborate set of substantive rules which its members agree will govern their foreign commerce.

Third, OTC would administer those rules. In so doing it would have the power to hear complaints brought by one member against another for violating GATT's rules. It would also have the power to require the accused member, the United States, for example, to consult with it regarding the complaint. Then it would have the power to make a decision or a ruling on the merits of the complaint as the majority of its executive committee or its assembly see the matter. Finally, OTC would have the power to authorize its members to impose sanctions against the accused member if the member did not comply with OTC's ruling or decision on the complaint.

Fourth, the provisions of GATT, which—as I have said—are the rules that OTC enforces, can be changed by a two-thirds majority vote of GATT's members. Since the United States has only one vote in GATT, new obligations could be imposed on it against its will.

Fifth, as a matter of fact, the United States is now technically in violation of GATT's rules. Many of our laws are in conflict with GATT. We have been given permission to continue this conflict between our laws and GATT only in respect to those laws which Congress passed prior to October 1947. Domestic legislation passed since that time—like the escape clause and the national defense amendment in H. R. 1—is not covered by this permission.

Sixth, once we are in OTC any member can bring a complaint against us for not bringing the laws I have just referred to into conformity with GATT. As I have explained, OTC can hear the complaint and if it wants to can authorize other member nations to impose economic sanctions against us.

Seventh, GATT has a provision which describes when it will become finally effective. At that time the permission I referred to a few moments ago to deviate from GATT's rules so far as laws on our books as of October 1947 will come to an end. Many time-honored provisions of our tariff and customs laws which have been on our statute books since long before 1947 are contrary to GATT's rules. They would have to be changed or we would be in violation of our GATT obligations and subject to complaints and penalties under the OTC machinery.

Although the Ways and Means Committee amended H. R. 5550 to specify that the United States will not be obliged to pass any specific laws to conform to GATT if we join OTC, this really will

not help much. The State Department claims full authority under the trade-agreements law to enter into GATT. If Congress bows to the State Department's wish in H. R. 5550, a simple proclamation could change our laws when pressure from GATT's members against our nonconformance with GATT becomes too great.

Among these laws which are threatened by our membership in GATT are the following:

First. American selling-price value provision for coal-tar chemicals.

Second. Existing customs valuation provisions of the Tariff Act.

Third. Antidumping law.

Fourth. Countervailing-duty law.

Fifth. The escape clause in United States trade-agreements legislation.

Sixth. Right to use import quotas.

Seventh. Right to use internal taxes on imports.

Eighth. Right to use mixing regulations which specify use of domestically produced raw materials.

Ninth. Right to correct customs classifications by judicial process without compensation to foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed about an international arrangement which could have such far-reaching effects on the policies of the United States Congress and our future control over those policies.

I am even more alarmed about the way in which the real significance of OTC and GATT have been concealed by the State Department. OTC and GATT are one of the most far-reaching grabs of authority which the executive department of our Government has ever attempted to carry out. There is precious little understanding at the moment on the part of the Members of Congress of the implications of the OTC bill. The study called for by the resolution is badly needed if the Congress is to pay any attention to its responsibilities under the Constitution for the regulation of foreign commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have many misgivings in regard to H. R. 5550. This measure would authorize the United States to become a member in the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC. This is an international organization composed of 35 contracting countries to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. Speaker, when we get into a discussion of all the ramifications of GATT and OTC, we run into a Pandora box of complications and contradictions. Even if it be granted that there is any merit to the proposal, there are so many unresolved issues involved that we cannot escape the fact that this legislation is untimely.

Let us take a brief look at just 1 or 2 phases of this thing. GATT is an executive agreement, entered into by our Government in 1947, under authority—or alleged authority—of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. That action has never been considered by the Congress. Nor has its validity been determined

by the courts. I am informed a considerable amount of litigation has resulted and certain legal aspects, including questions of constitutionality, remain unresolved. The American Bar Association is reported to doubt the constitutionality of OTC.

When OTC was created, it was proclaimed "to further the achievement and objectives set forth in GATT." Then, in 1955 that objective was amended to include the objectives of "raising standards of living, insuring full employment, promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties."

Now those objectives are in themselves fine for individual countries to seek. But should our country become tied to global objectives, which those are? Should we, by becoming a member of OTC, undertake to insure full employment, not only in this country but likewise in all the other countries which become members of OTC?

We have never adopted that sort of a policy for our own country. Indeed when it was proposed at the end of the war back in 1946 that the Government virtually guarantee full employment in the United States, the legislation, endorsed as I recall by Henry Wallace, was soundly repudiated by the Congress. It was felt by the Congress that such a philosophy ran counter to the principle of free enterprise and as being too expensive to talk about.

Should we endorse a principle which would apply on an international basis that has been repudiated by the Congress as applied to our own country alone? While the two situations are not identical there is an analogy that must be recognized. This is just one of the facets of this thing that needs study and clarification before permanent legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, when we get into the field of international trade, somewhere along the line the Congress must draw the line in respect to delegation of the powers and responsibilities assigned to it by the Constitution. We must be careful about frittering away the people's interests by giving tremendous powers to people who are not responsible to the American people, or even to the American Government. Let us approach this subject with care and caution.

It will be recalled that when the Trade Agreements Act was enacted it was intended primarily for the benefit of the United States, its economy and people. It was so stated in the act. But by a nibbling process, our own domestic interests seem to become secondary. I cannot find in the original act the authority for GATT and OTC. Their legitimacy remain in doubt.

The hearings held on H. R. 5550 suggest a multitude of questions on this subject going to both the propriety and legality of these various activities and proposals. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the time is not ripe for this legislation. It becomes more and more obvious that we should devote our energies to the clearing up of the more outstanding questions which bear on H. R. 5550 before the House passes on this bill. The House Ways and Means Committee should be



charged specifically to make a full review of these important problems.

I am pleased to join the able gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] in calling for a fuller investigation of this subject.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding to me and commend him for the unrelenting fight that he has made on behalf of the people of this country in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, now pending in this Congress is a bill, H. R. 5550, which would authorize our membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee have touched on many problems connected with this legislation. A review of the testimony before the committee quickly reveals that the issues involved are very complex. Despite this complexity, many have come to recognize the dangers inherent in the legislation.

One of the involved issues which H. R. 5550 throws open before this House is the conflict in the mechanisms and goals of the legislation and our domestic farm policy. In this instance the peril embodied by the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the accord which it would administer, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is very immediate and obvious. In fact, the Department of State which has already taken part in the so-called GATT accord for the past 9 years on what the Department has called a temporary or provisional basis, has laid this Nation's farm policy bare to the inroads of foreign influence.

As I see it, our farm policy should seek to afford the American farmer a fair, proportionate share of our national income. It should seek to enable him to obtain a standard of living comparable to the high national average which this Nation alone has achieved among the nations of the world. In so doing the Nation recognizes that this is a fair and just portion which the farmer can expect in return for the difficult labors in his fields.

We also strive to provide a workable farm program because the Nation recognizes that the prices of farm products must be stabilized for the good of the country as a whole. Economists point to the catastrophic drop in farm prices during the great depression in this country when they search for the reasons for our difficult recovery from that economic crisis. They also indicate that our farm population has served us admirably during the two world wars by a rapid increase in farm production. Unfortunately for the farmer, his activity is not the kind which adjust easily to the needs of a changing market. Our farm program has sought to secure for the farmers a fair share of our postwar prosperity in the face of these vagaries over which each of our farmers as an individual can have little control.

I hardly think that many will dispute the fact that our farm program is vital

for our national well-being. How then do we safeguard the rights of our farmers?

A part of this program is the payment of subsidies to farmers. These subsidies often give rise to domestic farm prices considerably above world market prices. As a result, our domestic farm prices are constantly in danger of being undercut by cheaper imports. To meet this problem we have had to impose import quotas on certain farm products. Among products protected in this manner are wheat, cotton, butter, cheese, dried milk, peanuts, almonds and filberts. In addition, imports beyond a certain level of products such as potatoes, wool, and tobacco are subject to extra tariff charges.

There is an unmistakable conflict with these import quotas which protect our farm program and certain GATT provisions. Article XI of the GATT provides that—

No . . . quotas . . . shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of . . . any other contracting party.

A conditioning clause in the GATT to this provision provides exceptions to this rule in GATT's article XI, section 2, and permits quotas on agricultural products provided domestic production is controlled and provided that such quotas will not reduce the share of the market normally held by imports. This would only tend to exempt some of our products such as wheat and tobacco from the GATT prohibition on import quotas. However, the question of whether or not the quotas fairly represent the share of the market normally held by imports is still open to question. It is highly significant that in cases of dispute, the question must be referred to the OTC, should OTC come into effect.

Our domestic production of butter, cheese, dried milk, rye, oats, barley, and linseed oil is not controlled. Therefore, the exception does not apply and under GATT rules we are not permitted to impose import quotas on these products.

Let me remind you at this point that the supporters of GATT and OTC have steadfastly maintained that these bodies have no power to influence our domestic legislation. In the event of conflicts, they say that domestic law is supreme or that Congress can act to declare them supreme. In this connection they point with pride to the waiver which has been granted to this Nation by GATT which permits us to maintain our existing quotas on farm products in the face of GATT prohibitions.

This is clearly a specious argument. It is obvious to me that if we must go to an international organization or conference arrangement to apply for a waiver, this action in itself implies that the organization in question has the power to grant or refuse. The action which granted the waiver in this instance, it seems to me, was a clear indication of authority.

Moreover, we made certain promises to obtain this waiver. The State Department promised that we would remove the existing quotas as soon as possible. I am sure that the primary producing countries that have been trying

to export to this country will see that pressure is applied on us to carry out this promise. In any case we must report progress made to remove the quotas once a year and if the quotas remain in effect, we must explain why and outline the steps we have taken to remove them.

I am at a loss to resolve these considerations with section 22 of the Agricultural Act which gives the President freedom to impose import fees within certain specified limits when he finds that imports threaten our farm program. Section 22 also provides that no international agreement entered into by the United States may be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of section 22.

I think that we must finally injure our national integrity if we keep subscribing to international accords and then constantly provide for their nonobservance in domestic legislation. We are attempting to balance on a razor's edge if we pursue such a policy and rely on the actions of an international body in which we have only 1 vote in 35 to enable us to maintain our precarious balance.

Many hope that we will gradually be able to solve the problem of our farm surpluses by exporting some of these. Here GATT opposes us again. It asks its members to renounce the use of subsidies which encourage the export of primary products. Here GATT also requires consultation and implies that it will decide on apportioning equitable shares of the world market to member nations.

These are merely a few of the ways in which GATT has intruded on our domestic scene. It is startling to find that GATT has been allowed to do so through no conscious policy on the part of the Congress. In these matters, the State Department has assumed the initiative under some rather tenuous authority.

Though the House Ways and Means Committee has struggled with the problems brought up before it, we still lack a clear-cut answer to many problems. The cause lies not with any fault of the committee but rather it springs from the confusion sown by the supporters of H. R. 5550 who state that a consideration of GATT is not a proper study for the committee when it reviews H. R. 5550.

On the contrary, there is a crying need to investigate the connection between congressional action on the OTC and what this implies as to the opinion of Congress on GATT. We must also have an accurate appraisal of what our membership in the OTC presages for our domestic legislation. I believe a need for such a review is made clear by my outline of present conflicts between GATT and our domestic farm policy.

I therefore support the resolution that calls for a study and report by the Ways and Means Committee on the GATT and its meaning in the light of the OTC.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I wonder what the gentleman thinks will be the reaction of the American people when they find out that they, and even the Department of Agriculture, if they wanted to impose an import quota or set up a subsidy, would

have to go to Geneva and ask permission of 34 contracting nations to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades before they could set up that subsidy or impose that quota?

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid they would think the Congress had failed miserably in its duty to them.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the gentleman heartily.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this House is to be presented with another bill which deals with the foreign trade of this Nation. Foreign trade has become increasingly important in the modern world. Within our generation, totalitarian powers, both Communist and Fascist, have shown how well they recognize the strategic importance of international commerce.

Not so many years ago, Nazi Germany demonstrated how ruthless economic methods can be applied to upset completely the theoretical foundations of so-called free trade. In an utterly cynical fashion, the Nazis manipulated bilateral agreements and exchange controls to suit their purposes of economic domination. They introduced practices which required whole new textbooks for adequate explanation. By skillful application of their ruthless methods, they held scores of unwary nations at their mercy.

These same nations unwittingly aided the Nazis in completing their preparations for war. The commercial relations between Nazi Germany and the nations with which it traded became anything but free. Moreover, the Nazis used their trade missions to spy on their trading partners.

In their anxiety to export at any price, all too many fell into the traps set by the totalitarian states. Rather than pay for the goods they imported with convertible currencies or valued goods and services, the totalitarian states allowed their trading partners to run up credit balances, weighted their balance of payments accounts with blocked accounts or flooded their markets with unessential goods.

We are all too apt to feel that this chapter in commercial policy belongs to history. Yet the methods employed in this period are still with us. True, there is no evidence that they are being employed in the Western World for those goals which the Nazis sought to achieve. Nevertheless, they still radically distort the old theoretical notions of free trade which are still put forward in many a text on international economics, in fervent disregard of today's economic realities.

There are still many free nations in this world who find themselves compelled to utilize unorthodox trade restrictions and systems of preferences. It is well known that in so doing they seek to prop up artificially their strategic economic positions and protect the standard of living of their people.

Into this scene, those who espouse free-trade doctrines have interjected a proposal for a world organization whose

aim is to remove trade restrictions. This House is soon to be confronted by a bill which would authorize United States membership in this new international agency which is to be called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The bill in question, of course, is H. R. 5550.

So far about 35 nations have subscribed tentatively to the OTC. Many of the candidates for membership are nations who have found it necessary to maintain trade restrictions to which I referred earlier. Many of the nations employing such restrictions hope to remove these in time in an orderly manner.

But there are others who seek to maintain these restrictions in order to encourage economic growth.

The OTC Charter and GATT, the instrument which it would implement, both provide for exceptions to provisions which prohibit the maintenance of trade restrictions such as import quotas and exchange controls, and other discriminatory trade practices.

It is hardly likely that our Nation will pursue policies which will qualify us to make use of such exceptions. On the other hand, certain nations within the western community have shown signs of consciously promoting such conditions so that they may qualify for the exceptions to the prohibitions by the OTC and GATT. Thus, they seek to force economic development. We are aware that the United States has favored the orderly development of national economies. However, I doubt whether we favor methods which would achieve economic development at all costs. There is evidence in the OTC Charter and the GATT documents that the establishment of the OTC would regularize such behavior.

So much for a dangerous feature of the OTC-GATT arrangement within our own sphere of influence. Though this is serious enough, there is much more cause for concern when we look toward the East.

It should be noted at this point that Communist Czechoslovakia is to be a member of the OTC. True, Czechoslovakia is only one nation among the satellite group. The Soviet Union has made no move to join the OTC though it expressed some interest in its forerunner, the ITO. Nevertheless, it is sufficient for Soviet purposes to have Czechoslovakia present as an observer among the 35 member nations.

It is well to keep in mind the recent appearance of Czechoslovakia on the international commercial scene. Let us remember that it was an action by Czechoslovakia which touched off the heightened tensions in the Middle East. It did so by shipping arms to Egypt.

Here it is well to ask whether we should enter an organization with this Communist nation after its recent transgression. Certainly there is a moral question involved. It should be asked how we can act in concert with a nation which has recently undertaken an action in international trade running directly counter to our interests and the interests of world peace and security.

Even more portentous are the possible future consequences which Czechoslovakian membership in the OTC could

have. Czechoslovakia will be able to sit in on negotiating sessions which heretofore under GATT have been closed to many interested parties in the United States. The hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 5550 have raised serious apprehensions over how our OTC membership—and our participation in GATT—affects our congressional responsibility to regulate our tariffs and foreign commerce. In view of some of the trade practices of some GATT member nations and in view of the threat posed by the membership of Czechoslovakia, it is vital that we have more exact information.

In recent months it has become painfully clear that the Communists intend to make greater use of international trade as a weapon in the cold war. This makes even more necessary the retention of our freedom of action in foreign trade matters. How much will our membership in the OTC infringe upon this freedom of action?

The House Ways and Means Committee has turned up a substantial amount of evidence that the powers of this Congress over foreign trade has been hobbled by GATT and may suffer a decided eclipse with the passage of H. R. 5550. However, since the committee's immediate aim was not concerned with this problem, I feel that a more searching inquiry on this subject is necessary before the House can act to authorize membership in the OTC.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia and the other Members on both sides of the aisle that have joined him in what I sincerely believe is an effort in behalf of the American people. This is a fight which should be near and dear to the heart of every American, because what the gentleman from West Virginia is endeavoring to do is defend this country against our actual enemy. I know that while sometimes we are disheartened at the response we get, in the long run those that come after us will be thankful that there have been such leaders as the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I have spent 10 years in this fight. It has been time donated willingly. I believe the very foundations of the Republic are involved in this matter. The Congress cannot surrender its constitutional rights to regulate our commerce, tariff, and trade.

Mr. SAYLOR. I agree heartily with the gentleman. I sincerely believe that what is involved in this matter is that it is up to Congress to determine whether the Founding Fathers actually meant that Congress should handle these matters, or whether the present Members of Congress are not willing to face up to their responsibility in this modern day



and age but instead are willing to delegate their constitutional rights to some other group.

The thing I think the gentleman from West Virginia should be congratulated for is that he has pointed out that he is not against trade—he is not against foreign trade—he is against the Congress abdicating to another agency of Government its given rights.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and have spoken on the floor of the House in opposition to such proposals as H. R. 5550. I object to this bill and to any and every project which I consider to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I appreciate that the Ways and Means Committee did adopt certain amendments to the original bill in a conscientious and sincere effort to make it as palatable as possible. Unfortunately, the amendments do not change the basic concept of the bill in any way. So far as I am able to ascertain, the activities of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade organization would remain unchanged, except that there would now be an international bureaucratic agency—that is, the Organization for Trade Cooperation—set up to devote full time to empire building and to devising ways of controlling foreign trade without the consent of Congress.

To me, GATT must go if America's international commerce is to be administered by the duly delegated legislative branch of our Government. To extend the assumed powers of the State Department and non-American delegates in the making of trade agreements for this Nation would be nothing short of tyrannical if it were to be arranged without consent that can come only through a constitutional amendment.

Let us examine for a moment what would happen if Congress were to give ear to the demands of the international groups behind H. R. 5550. The OTC would sit in Geneva, armed with an assembly, an executive committee, and a secretariat with the power to call international trade conferences of GATT members. The work of members of this group—responsive to no voters in the United States—would of a certainty be devoted to methods of expanding foreign trade without any thought whatsoever of the consequences to American industry and labor. State Department spokesmen who have testified in favor of H. R. 5550 have made it clear that their objective is to lower America's tariff barriers. Their intention is to strengthen diplomatic ties, not to enter into the field of foreign trade with the idea of helping this country improve economically.

What chance would any industry, any group of workers, or any farmers in this country stand to make themselves heard in Geneva under such circumstances? If trade concessions are to be made for the purpose of providing assistance to other countries, then those deals should be made in the name of international aid—not under the label of good business.

Through H. R. 5550, the State Department expects Congress to hand over to it the exercise of controls vested in this legislative body by the Constitution. Once cloaked with this authority the Department would immediately toss it into an international pool, as indicated by the record which the Department has made in postwar years. The transfer of power over tariffs and trade has already been carried so far by the State Department that—unless Congress checkmates the trend—our national policy on foreign trade will become bound to the whims of so-called diplomats wearing the colors of several score foreign insignia.

The blunderings of the State Department, as already exhibited since its usurpation of authority in the field of foreign commerce, should in themselves be sufficient warning to place Congress on guard against any further surrender of power. Who among us is willing to report to his constituents that he has participated in a movement to permit foreign traders to make the laws of our land in respect to what and how much we are going to export and import?

My own congressional district has suffered so much from the unwise tariff policies thrust upon this Nation by the State Department theorists that we have actually been placed at a disadvantage from which it will be a long time until we can recover. As an example, consider the case of foreign residual oil. Until this administration recognized the threat to our national economy and security contained in a policy which permitted unrestricted imports of residual oil to enter our markets, millions of tons of bituminous coal from western Pennsylvania were refused a market outlet. The situation has eased in the past year, but there is still ample room for further improvement.

Now look back to the coal which would have been mined and sold had it not been for the unfair competition of foreign residual oil. Month after month, year after year, more and more of our miners were relegated to the ranks of the unemployed. Railroaders, too, lost countless paychecks as a consequence of these inequitable policies, and the impact was felt throughout our coal and transportation centers. Hundreds of young boys and girls completing their high school courses were deprived of an opportunity to obtain a higher education. Some of them are still hopeful that their fathers will be able to catch up on back bills and eventually make it possible for them to enter college, but many found the situation at home so hopeless that they were forced to give up forever any idea of pursuing their scholastic training. These are among the unlisted tolls of an unrealistic foreign trade policy. Add to them the heartaches occasioned by the knowledge that many little children were undernourished through no fault of their parents and you will understand why I—for one—am receiving hundreds of communications objecting to the proposals contained in H. R. 5550.

Our coal and railroad workers are not the only groups who have had a practical lesson in the evils of uncontrolled foreign trade. The glass industry constitutes an important segment of the economy in

my congressional district. Our families who depend upon the glass industry for a living have seen firsthand what can happen to an industry and to a community when the products of cheap labor in alien lands are admitted into this country without proper application of tariff provisions. The same situation is applicable in the case of pottery workers, machine tool manufacturers, and in any category of workers exposed to the effects of an unrealistic trade program. Our farmers would be placed in a most untenable position if H. R. 5550 were enacted. They now have some protection through the tariffs and quotas implicit in section 22 of the Agricultural Act, but—given the right to dispose of tariffs and quotas—the State Department and its foreign collaborators could quickly bring about the flooding of our food markets with the products of coolie wages, thus depriving our own great agricultural family from any opportunity of enjoying increased levels of income.

Mr. Speaker, in emphasizing my opposition to H. R. 5550, I should like to state at this time that I am in complete agreement with the resolution introduced by my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], calling for a thorough investigation of our membership in GATT. I feel that this inquiry should take place. Meanwhile, the proper course for the House to take at this time would be to recommit H. R. 5550 when it is called up, and await the outcome of the GATT investigation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD in support of this resolution the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to make a complete investigation of certain background information necessary for a better understanding of the meaning of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation as proposed in H. R. 5550.

I support the resolution because I feel that Congress has not gained sufficient understanding of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and its operations and ramifications, to give it the approval that immediate passage of the OTC bill would provide.

In my district, and in my State, there are a number of industries vitally affected by import competition. The welfare of tens of thousands of workers is at stake, and their future is bound up with the tariff and trade legislation we pass here.

Sometimes we feel it does not matter very much whether we pass or do not pass this bill or that bill. I assure you that it matters a great deal what we do in tariff legislation. Those engaged in industrial, or farming and fishing operations back home hold us responsible for what we do here and I am sure they want to keep a system under which they as constituents, and we as their elected

representatives, can exercise control over what is done to them, or for them, by Congress.

Many of us are aware that the whole question of who is to control our foreign trade and tariff policies is at stake in H. R. 5550. I have seen denials of this, but they either come to nothing, or are based on an acceptance of the controls already exercised by GATT over our foreign trade and tariff policies. It may be said the approval of the OTC would not add to the powers of GATT; that may be true. Therefore, we are asked, what is wrong with approving United States membership in the OTC?

The point at issue is not that OTC would add to the existing powers of either the President or GATT over the regulation of our foreign commerce. The question is whether by passing H. R. 5550 Congress will put its stamp of approval on its own divestment of authority and responsibility.

The State Department, drawing on power delegated in the Trade Agreements Act, has already delivered much of the previous congressional power over to GATT. Many of us have objected strenuously to such freehanded disposal of congressional control and certainly we do not wish today to do anything, either to confirm or encourage it. Approval of OTC now would confirm the objectionable past action of the State Department in this field and would encourage GATT to go even further in the future.

This is the first opportunity that Congress has had to express its opinion on what has appeared to many of us as the siphoning away of our constitutional obligations, and lodging them in an international organization where the voice of Congress does not penetrate.

GATT has never been before us. We have not been able to come to grips with it. We therefore could not register our sentiment.

It will be said that we could have done so when the Trade Agreements Act was up for renewal, from time to time. On those occasions there were other considerations and to avoid creating the impression that extension of the Trade Agreements Act meant approval of GATT, Congress, as is well known, successively adopted a caveat or caution saying that our action was not to be construed as approving or disapproving GATT.

GATT is not before us now; but we are confronted with a situation in which approval of something else that is before us, namely, the OTC, would also confirm GATT. It would confirm and approve all that the State Department has done in negotiating GATT and extending its own powers, and those of GATT, by operating through GATT as a member and disposing of many agenda items that bear directly on matters that fall properly into the zone of congressional control.

Therefore, while GATT is not officially before us, we are confronted with the meaning of GATT, with the history of GATT, including its inception, the character of its operations, the trend of its decisions, and much else of substantial significance. We should not let this op-

portunity, perhaps the only one that we will have, slip by without examining GATT.

The Congress should not be asked to take a step as crucial as that proposed in H. R. 5550—one that would settle a highly controversial issue of nearly 10 years' standing—without examining the background and weighing the consequences of our action, with full access to all the GATT documents, including its numerous protocols and interpretations.

I would feel that we were voting in the dark, and were being asked to vote in the dark, unless GATT is brought officially before us. That is why I endorse the resolution.

Consider for a moment what the situation might be if Russia should ask to be admitted to GATT, and therefore the OTC. This possibility is not the figment of a feverish imagination.

Russia knocked at the door of UNESCO and was admitted in April 1954. She knocked at the door of the ILO and was admitted. In 1955 she expressed an interest in joining the ITO—the International Trade Organization—unaware that the ITO never came into being or confusing it with GATT or the proposed OTC.

Clearly the question of Russian membership is one that must not be ignored. Who knows what it would mean?

In the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 Russia and all Communist-dominated countries were excluded from enjoyment of the concessions—tariff reductions—that we had given to other countries and which would have been extended automatically to Russia and other Communist countries under the most-favored-nation clause.

Could Russia, by coming into GATT, circumvent this congressional mandate? It is a nice question. The State Department and not Congress decides for the United States whether we will support the application for membership in GATT by a given country. We—that is the United States—supported the membership of Japan in GATT and Japan came in although 14 countries, among them some of the leading trading nations, refused to extend their concessions to that country.

Please note that it was the State Department and not Congress that determined our support of the Japanese application to join GATT. Should Russia apply for membership, the State Department and not Congress would decide for the United States whether we would support the application.

Should Russia come in, I ask again, what would happen to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which directed the President to withdraw all our trade agreements concessions from Russia and other Communist-controlled countries? Would her admission upset this law, which was put into effect by the President? You may recall that in 1951 the President quickly complied with the mandate from Congress to withdraw our trade-agreements concessions from Communist countries, with one exception. That exception was Czechoslovakia. We had to apply to GATT for permission to drop that country from our most-favored-nation list.

Why? It was because Czechoslovakia was a member of GATT; and GATT itself lays down the procedure to be followed in the withdrawal of concessions. As it turned out GATT supported our position but we had no assurance it would do so.

The upshot is that membership in GATT bestows privileges and obligations, about which Congress is not consulted. We may pass a law but GATT decides whether it will be carried out.

If Russia did come into GATT she could cause embarrassment to the State Department, and to the Congress. As a member of GATT and OTC she could challenge many of our commercial practices. The whole system of waivers and exceptions would be made to order for her genius at tying an organization into knots.

I raise these questions, not because I have the answers, but to show how little we know of the probable effects of approval of H. R. 5550. It seems to me imperative that we study GATT thoroughly before we give it our approval by a casual process of voting for OTC membership. I believe it would be a profound mistake if we proceed without this necessary information. The resolution would give us the needed opportunity. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the resolution on a GATT-OTC study by the Ways and Means Committee. I was not one of those who testified before the committee a few weeks ago when it held hearings on H. R. 5550; but it was not from lack of interest and deep concern.

Because I come from an area that has long been in the forefront of import competition, particularly in the case of pottery and glassware, I have had occasion to keep in touch with the developments in our international excursions in tariff and trade matters. While I am not an expert in the field, I do not hesitate to say that no member of this body should be asked to vote for United States membership in the OTC, as provided in H. R. 5550, without more information to go on than that contained in the proposal itself and in the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation, signed in March 1955 in Geneva, Switzerland.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee were confined to these documents. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the very agreement that this legislation is all about and without which the OTC would be wholly meaningless, was not sent in by the President for ratification or even for examination in connection with the OTC. The reason is very clear. The State Department did not care to have Congress examine into the GATT record.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that a full exposure of the usurpations of power by GATT, not only abetted, but in some instances promoted



by, our own Department of State, would lead not only to a rejection of OTC membership by Congress but to a restraint on GATT itself. That explains why GATT was not sent over.

The State Department in coming before Congress with its own negotiated OTC is trying to execute a clever end run. It well knows and has good reason to know that Congress would not approve GATT if the general agreement that forms the basis of GATT were transmitted to Congress for scrutiny. Therefore, the Department sought a way of getting approval of GATT from Congress by indirection and without exposing the ill-favored and illegitimate whatever-it-is to Congress at all.

That is why we have H. R. 5550. It makes no mention of GATT. It only calls for membership in the OTC.

I say the maneuver is a fraud, a deception.

Approval of the OTC would be an approval of GATT for the simple reason that the OTC would undertake to carry out the provisions of GATT. We would not be so stupid as to approve an agency that would administer an agreement and seek to give it effect if we did not approve of the agreement itself.

Why then, in the name of honest procedure, was the general agreement not sent to Congress for examination in a public hearing? We are asked to put our stamp of approval on an agreement without knowing what is in it. How contemptuous can an executive department become in its treatment of Congress?

The agreement has been in effect since January 1, 1943. It has been a storm center of controversy since it was signed in Geneva. Its assumed powers have been sharply challenged on many occasions. Many who have kept watch on its operations have protested its encroachment on the powers of Congress. There has never been a satisfactory explanation of its source of power; no lines of demarcation and no specifications of its jurisdiction have ever been issued. It is a jungle of world economic planning and of uninhibited ambitions.

GATT has been operating as a going concern without approval by Congress. In 1949 the State Department said that authority for negotiation of GATT was not fully dependent upon the Trade Agreements Act. Nearly half of its 35 articles, the Department said, looked to the general authority of the President to conduct foreign affairs, for their justification. Later this position was abandoned. Now the Department claims that the Trade Agreements Act itself provided ample authority for State Department negotiation of GATT.

Was the Department right in 1949 or is it right in its later interpretation, or was it perhaps wrong on both occasions?

With the GATT agreement in hand, unratified as it was, the State Department was in a position to twist the arm of Congress and thus smother all opposition. The Department could and did make agreements that snatched the power of Congress right out of its hands. Congressional protests were answered by pointing to the delicate international situation.

"Don't rock the boat. Don't offend our friends. Don't disappoint them. Don't drive them into the hands of Russia."

With cautions of this kind the Department could intimidate Congress. It is a species of coercion, bordering even on blackmail.

We all know or should know that in 1951 Congress directed the President to cut off all trade agreement concessions from Russia and other Communist-controlled countries. In carrying out the mandate the President, however, ran into a snag. Czechoslovakia was both a Communist-controlled country as well as a member of GATT. The President notified Russia and all the other Communist countries that our trade-agreement concessions would be withdrawn; but in the case of Czechoslovakia even the President's own hands were tied.

They were tied by the fact that since Czechoslovakia was a member of GATT we could not withdraw our concessions from that country without first obtaining the "O. K." of GATT—unless, of course, we elected to withdraw from GATT entirely. This we were not likely to do since GATT was largely a creature of our own State Department.

But not only did the President find his own hands tied by an agreement that was made in his own name but he was unable to carry out the mandate of Congress.

The question is how, when, and in what manner did the Congress ever empower the State Department, directly or indirectly to enter into an international agreement that could be used effectively to block the execution of an act of Congress?

This is not the only example. At the ninth session of GATT in Geneva in 1954-55 the United States was granted a waiver permitting us to maintain in effect temporarily our import quotas on certain agricultural products. These import quotas on wheat, raw cotton, peanuts, dairy products, and some grains were established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

They were found to be in violation of the GATT ban on import quotas. Yet these quotas were imposed in accordance with procedures established to carry out section 22, just mentioned.

Once more the question arises how GATT obtained the power to review the implementation of an act of Congress carried out under the constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce? Again, how, when, and by whom did GATT become vested with such power?

These questions and others like them have been asked before. They have remained without answer; at least, they have not been answered under circumstances that would permit a congressional response. GATT has been kept at more than arm's length from Congress. Many of us have waited a long time for the opportunity of an accounting.

We want to review the stewardship of the State Department over the powers delegated to the executive in the Trade Agreements Act. Many questions remain without a satisfactory answer.

If the State Department claims that the Trade Agreements Act gave the executive all these powers to do what has been done under GATT we want a citation of chapter and verse. I do not think we ever extended such power. I do not believe that Congress ever had in mind placing a weapon in the hands of the State Department that the Department could use to bar Congress from exercising its constitutional authority by throwing roadblocks of international moral commitments across its path.

If Congress did do so, and the State Department can establish it to our satisfaction, we want to know that too.

Whatever the situation, this end play by the State Department has been going on long enough, too long in fact. Now is both the time and the occasion for a review.

One would think that the State Department itself would come forward in view of the controversy stirred up by GATT operations, and offer its record for review; but no. Instead of that we are treated to the same kind of evasion and contemptible tactics that have been characteristic of the Department in this field in the past 10 years. Mark my words, if the Department continues in its stiffnecked attitude it will end before long with complete deprivation of the delegated authority entrusted to it.

Congress should not even think of passing on OTC membership without an accounting by the State Department—and a detailed one—on GATT and its operations and on the Department's stewardship. Naturally I support the resolution and give notice right now to the State Department that its tactics have fooled no one who has had occasion to observe the GATT operations over a period of years.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, finally I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the comments of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5550, which would authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, was recently reported out by the Ways and Means Committee. It presents this Congress with a very complex proposal. I see no precedent for the plan as it has been presented. This very simply worded bill, H. R. 5550, would commit the United States to a complex series of obligations.

If this Congress approves OTC, then it also acts affirmatively on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT. It is true that we were led into GATT by the State Department in 1947 and have been bound by its decisions ever since. Yet, from the point of view of normal legislative processes, this has occurred by most unorthodox methods. Congress has never been asked to approve or disapprove GATT until now, in this roundabout way. As a result the agreement itself was not sent to Congress for review.

The Congress has constantly been reassured that it need not concern itself with GATT. There is something indi-

rect in this. The Department of State asks Congress not to concern itself with substantive rules and regulations embodied by GATT but instead asks that Congress pass on this Nation's membership in an organization (i. e., the OTC) which would administer GATT.

The spotlight should therefore really be on GATT. Frankly, I am at a loss to characterize it briefly. It defies a brief description. It has sometimes been called an accord. We know it largely as a conference arrangement which has exercised far-reaching influence on the tariff and trade policy of the United States. In reaching decisions on its actions, it has made little reference to any organ of the Government of the United States. This Congress has certainly not been consulted by GATT on its actions. Indeed, as I have indicated, the Congress is constantly advised not to concern itself about GATT. In the press of the legislation coming before this Congress, there has been a compulsion to sidestep the issues which surround GATT. But now we can no longer sidestep the question without neglecting our duty. We have to look at GATT carefully if we are to know what we are asked to approve.

In the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, the supporters of H. R. 5550 presented us with a host of glittering generalities. These were generally unsupported by the documents in question or the facts of United States participation in international trade. For example, on March 1 the Secretary of State disposed of the substantive questions surrounding H. R. 5550 by stating:

We found that American participation in GATT was serving the national interest of the United States by strengthening economic ties with our partners and allies.

Nowhere in the presentation of the Department of State before the House Ways and Means Committee was there a factual study in support of these generalizations. Evidently the Department regarded it neither necessary nor desirable to supply Congress with fuller information.

In the brief recitation of the functions of the OTC, the Department of State listed "Administering the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade." With this phrase, the Department of State disposed of GATT in connection with H. R. 5550.

Judging from the weight of supporting material given in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, the preponderance seems to be definitely on the side of the opponents to H. R. 5550. This fact has given rise to uneasiness about OTC membership in Congress. This uneasiness led the Ways and Means Committee itself to amend H. R. 5550 in an attempt to overcome the objections.

Another issue which the Department of State skirted in cavalier fashion is our influence within the club that would be set up by the members of GATT-OTC. We actually account for a little over 20 percent of the club's trade. The United States has been asked to cover 20 percent of the operating expenses of this club. I presume it was easy for the GATT negotiators to agree on a weight-

ed share for the United States when it came to levying charges on members.

But what happened when it came to handing out votes? The United States is to have only one vote in 35. Thus, when it comes to decision-making, we are accorded a voice no more powerful than that of the smallest member of the OTC.

Our influence in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank is based on a more realistic assessment of our importance in the sphere of international commerce and finance. In these bodies we account for nearly a third of the available vote. Thus the strength of our voice is roughly proportionate to our capital contribution to the fund and the bank.

I need not stress the fact that our interests are protected along similar lines in the United Nations through our standing membership in the Security Council and our veto power there.

Naturally the supporters of H. R. 5550 claim that the OTC is not comparable to the United Nations, the IMF or the World Bank. They find that the OTC is purely administrative. As I implied in the beginning of my remarks, I for one am not convinced by the generalizations of H. R. 5550 supporters.

Cognizant of these and other problems connected with H. R. 5550, the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, as already stated, reported out the bill with six amendments. The amendments reflect uneasiness caused by the manner in which the OTC was presented to the committee and the way in which it was supported before the committee. But, I am afraid the amendments have not removed the disturbing questions connected with H. R. 5550.

I believe that the American electorate would have this Congress take the initiative to investigate thoroughly matters which affect their vital interest. No one can question the importance of legislation affecting our foreign trade and tariff legislation for every inhabitant of this nation. Mere disclaimers or amendments to H. R. 5550, though they reflect concern over this Congressional responsibility, do not overcome the objections to H. R. 5550.

The heart of the issue is that in approving the OTC we would also be approving GATT which has not been brought before Congress; and that amendments to the OTC do not extend to GATT itself. We would be ratifying GATT as it is without having a look at it. Because of this circumstance I agree with the resolution presented here and urge its adoption.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate in this discussion and to say I think the gentleman has rendered a service in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Maine, I appreciate having his assistance and cooperation in this matter. My thanks also go to others of my colleagues who have participated in this panel discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman has yielded to me, I want to thank him again for the splendid address he is making on behalf of the people of the entire country. The gentleman's State and the State of Pennsylvania have already felt what some of the other States are going to experience under this GATT and OTC, if it is adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have long had strong misgivings about the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and have for that reason voted against extension of the Trade Agreements Act itself.

It is not a question of being against the expansion of trade. I can appreciate as much as anyone the value of foreign trade. That is not the same as saying that we should expand trade regardless of the consequences, regardless of what increased imports would do to our own industries. In my State we have textile manufacturing, including lacemaking; costume jewelry, cutlery, toys, pens and pencils, scientific apparatus and other manufacturing industries that face unfair competition from low-wage countries.

In my opinion the best way to expand trade is to regulate its flow so that it will not do more damage than good. We buy more abroad when our own industry is in a prosperous condition and we buy less if our industry is weakened and depressed. Imports from low-wage countries, as we all know, can help weaken and depress our industries unless the conditions of importation are properly regulated.

It is not my purpose, however, to dwell on the question of freer trade or protection. There is more at stake in H. R. 5550, the OTC bill, than this question. That is why I support the resolution that calls for investigation and study of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—particularly that part of it that relates to the exercise of power over our tariff and trade policies.

I make no secret of it: I want Congress to keep and to exercise the power granted to it by the Constitution to regulate our foreign commerce. This is not only a power; it is a responsibility that we owe our constituents, the people who have a right to look to us for carrying out our constitutional functions. We have no right to shift this power to an international trade organization.

Now, I know that it is said that Congress would lose none of its authority in this field if we should join the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I do not agree. It is a disclaimer that cannot be substantiated by the facts and represents little more than an effort to lull Congress into complacency.

If the OTC were to exercise no power, if it would not push Congress farther to one side, why would the State Department suggest that we become a member? There is no point in joining an international organization for the sake of joining. If the OTC would be as weak and helpless as its proponents contend,



it would be a useless society for the waste of the taxpayer's money.

Judging from the past, the OTC is not intended as a club to serve as a rendezvous for international socialites. The State Department has a record of power accumulation under GATT that throws an entirely different light on the OTC.

Starting with the Trade Agreements Act and carrying through GATT, that Department has spun a thread of delegated power into a web of international authority so interwoven and complicated that Congress can hardly take a step today toward the regulation of foreign commerce, be it a tariff question, a matter of import quotas, or disposal of farm surpluses, without getting entangled in some provisions of GATT. And what GATT means nobody knows.

There are many opinions; but there is no authority except GATT itself. And what GATT was last year or the year before is not what GATT is today, and what GATT is today is not what it may be next year.

For one thing, most countries, or groups of countries of similar economic position, have accommodated themselves in GATT with an assortment of exceptions. This process in turn is so overlaid with cross-hatched waivers, compensatory claims, rights of withdrawal, preference systems, and retaliatory privileges that only a mathematician trained in calculus could find his way through the maze.

I repeat I support the resolution of my colleagues for a close scrutiny of the general agreement—GATT—and this new OTC proposal that would wed us permanently to GATT. At the same time I must record my strong doubt that a study of GATT will tell us very much. I am afraid we could study it for 6 months and come away more confused about it than now.

Nevertheless I go along with the idea that we ought at least to try to penetrate the mysteries of the Geneva document before we give it our sanction. An affirmative vote on the OTC would be exactly that. We have never had an opportunity in Congress to vote on GATT. We are not being given that opportunity now.

It is not difficult to understand why the State Department did not send GATT to Congress along with the OTC. If by obtaining approval of the OTC it could automatically by the same step get ratification of GATT, why ruin the chances by exposing GATT itself to public view?

There is something about GATT that is not generally known. It has more than once amended itself since its first appearance on October 30, 1947. This is not surprising. It was born of the ITO (International Trade Organization) and the ITO died on the operating table of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1950. It never came out of the ether. Since the ITO was to absorb GATT but never came into being, GATT needed some going over.

Thus, while it is not surprising that the GATT amended itself, the fact that it has the power of self-amendment is

not only very significant, it is crucial to an understanding of H. R. 5550. For one thing, it leaves Congress to one side. Yet some of the amendments to GATT, past, present, or future, may be of the greatest interest and concern to industries, farmers, and workers in this country—all of them represented in Congress and looking to Congress to speak for them in such matters.

By "leaving Congress to one side," I mean such amendments of GATT by GATT are not submitted to Congress for approval.

This power of self-amendment is significant for another reason. No doubt it troubled the Ways and Means Committee because I cannot believe that that great committee could abet the stripping away of its own power and responsibility by substituting GATT in Geneva for itself. The committee therefore sought to plug the hole. It adopted an amendment saying that only Congress can authorize amendments on behalf of the United States to the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Unfortunately an amendment to the OTC is something quite different from an amendment to GATT itself. Nothing in the OTC amendment can bind GATT nor does such amendment require that amendments to GATT itself can be accepted for the United States only by Congress. They are and have been offered and adopted by GATT members acting together in Geneva. OTC would not change that regardless of the Ways and Means Committee amendment.

In another amendment the committee provides that adoption of the OTC neither repeals nor "modifies by implication or otherwise any existing legislation of the United States."

If read carefully this simply means that the act of passing H. R. 5550 will not of itself repeal or modify any existing legislation. That is not the same as saying that the representative of the United States may not agree to provisions that call for modification or repeal of any of our existing laws. Nor is it the same as saying that by adopting this amendment Congress thereby cancels agreements already made by the State Department calling for modification or repeal of existing legislation. Nor, finally, will it restore laws that have already been altered by way of implementing provisions in GATT that conflicted with domestic law.

Evidently the amendments, which I understand were all approved by the State Department, were drawn too hastily in view of the very complicated situation that has grown up. They fall far short of accomplishing their apparent purpose. It is doubtful that amendments to the OTC bill itself could in any case, prevent self-amendment by GATT.

I concur certainly that the whole matter needs much more study.

Whether any study can straighten out this barbed wire entanglement is doubtful, but I am convinced that we should not proceed without the investigation called for in the resolution. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DOYLE, for 5 days, on official business as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, now holding hearings in Los Angeles, under Public Law 601.

Mr. GREEN (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for today and the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TUMULTY and to include a speech by the Honorable JAMES C. MURRAY, of Illinois.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an editorial and other matter.

Mr. PELL.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHUDOFF.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. COLE) in two instances and to include tabulations of figures.

Mr. POWELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. PATMAN to revise and extend remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. HYDE).

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. PRIEST.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6712. An act to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1755. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1955, made pursuant to the request of the Corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1756. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1757. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1758. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1759. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1760. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1761. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 243); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5550. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; with amendments (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. S. 2851. An act to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona; without amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8385. A bill to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9358. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; with amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10251. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10441. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict its application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to a food and clothing report (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 10592. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 10593. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 10594. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 10595. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 10596. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10597. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 10598. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10599. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 10600. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 10601. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10602. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 10603. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 10604. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 10605. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 10606. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. R. 10607. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil,



water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 10608. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 10609. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 10610. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10611. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10612. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10613. A bill to reduce the individual income tax by 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10614. A bill to preserve permanently as a national park, an area of national significance in Colorado and Utah, such park to be known as the Dinosaur National Park, which shall supersede the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that moving expenses paid by an employer for a new employee shall not be included in the gross income of the employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10616. A bill to provide for the organization of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10617. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation on a 1-cent indictment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 10618. A bill to provide a temporary extension of certain special provisions relating to State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10619. A bill—

#### DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which, among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective

administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 10620. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 10621. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 10622. A bill to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10623. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10624. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 10625. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in fee between the United States of America and the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10626. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 10627. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10628. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10629. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10630. A bill relating to the District Court of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10631. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the construction of school facilities in Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10632. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RADWAN (by request):

H. R. 10633. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that cer-

tain employees who terminate their railroad employment shall be entitled to a refund of the railroad retirement taxes which they have paid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10634. A bill to provide for the formulation of a plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10635. A bill to preserve permanently as a national park, an area of national significance in Colorado and Utah, such park to be known as the Dinosaur National Park, which shall supersede the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 10636. A bill authorizing the construction of a project on the Eel River for local flood protection at Sandy Prairie in the vicinity of Fortuna, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 10637. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 10638. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 10639. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10640. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the America's New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10641. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10642. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to exempt certain retired officers of the Armed Forces from the operation of section 216 thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 476. Resolution to pay certain expenses incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 604. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from April 14, to April 27, 1957; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the house of representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Water-shops Pond, in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth memorializing Congress

to enact certain legislation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watersheds Pond in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation establishing proper flood control measures in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 10644. A bill for the relief of Hylin Golding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 10645. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sai Ip Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 10646. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sen Lai Wong and her daughter, Yu Kiang Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10648. A bill for the relief of Thomas Haggerty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 10649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Reveley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 10650. A bill for the relief of Lillian Cummings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10651. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10652. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Lindall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10653. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Buoy Ngow Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

920. By Mr. CEDERBERG: Petition of Mrs. Amanda Olson, Big Rapids, Mich., and 104 others expressing their appreciation to the Ways and Means Committee for extending alcoholic beverage taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

921. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Ensign John R. Monaghan Post 51 and 150, Veterans of Spokane, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

922. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 45 veterans of Ironton, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and

their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

923. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Basil, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

924. Also, petition of 79 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wellston, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

925. Also, petition of 31 veterans of Baltimore, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

926. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of California urging passage of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit interstate advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

927. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Erick Lund and 17 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

928. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. George Paine and 117 other residents of Clarion and Shippensburg, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

929. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of LeRoy W. Lewis, Vassar, Mich. and 300 others for separate pension program for World War I veterans, their widows and orphans and urging its immediate enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

930. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Federation of Economic Organizations, Marunouchi, Tokyo, relative to the discrimination against the sale of Japanese textiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 6 I delivered at the sixth annual conference on high energy nuclear physics, in Rochester, N. Y., an address entitled "Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?" I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE HALT THE RACE FOR ATOMIC ARMS?  
(Address of Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

A New England author reminded us many years ago that trouble is like hot weather: It sours milk and sweetens apples.

The power of the atom has its twin aspects; it can blow whole cities to bits; yet

it might bind this frightened world together.

Somewhere between the blast of Hiroshima and the hoped-for dawn of such a millennium of perpetual peace lies the no-man's land we now so timidly explore—a narrow strip of neutral territory between the barbed-wire entanglements of the world's great armed camps. In it labor the men of science and religion and politics, the possessors of faith and hope, who believe that destruction need not be the destiny of our day and civilization, who know that it is possible to be secure as well by the majesty of what we do as by the might of what we have, and who trust that the intelligence which enables us to split the atom for a bomb will in time teach us to use the split atom for the advancement of man and the glory of his God.

My academic training gives me no right to speak at a meeting called to discuss problems of high energy physics. My purpose this evening is to ask if there is a role that you men of science may play in proposing an affirmative answer to the question: Can we halt the race for atomic arms?

Day by day in the Congress of the United States we are alerted to that question. It colors the debate on the size of our military establishment. It increases as our agricultural storehouses fill and overflow. It influences the volume of our foreign aid. It throws into sharp controversy the relative

value of guided missiles and jet aircraft. It builds a nuclear Navy and equips an atomic Army. We know all about Nike batteries; we watch ground-to-air, air-to-ground and air-to-air encounters. But we find no peace.

And yet, through all our thinking runs the belief that the true significance and greater ultimate effect of atomic energy for the human race will come, not from its destructive capabilities but from its contributions to the betterment of man's lot upon this earth. The weapons of mass destruction are impressive, but so would be the fruits of peace. The difficulty has been that the power to destroy comes before and grows faster than the power to build.

Has that not been the story of mankind? Are not the destructive uses of power the simplest and those most likely first to occur when a new source is discovered?

Certainly man's first experience with chemical and electronic energy as released in an ordinary fire told him of its destructive character. When forests spanned this continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, our ancestors saw fires originate in lightning, which itself was a source of terror and disaster, and then saw the flames reach up to topple the mightiest trees. They ran for their lives from the fire, and the wild animals of the field and forest ran with them. It took generations to learn how to tame



the elemental force of fire, to bend it to their own purposes in the cooking of food, the refining of ores and the casting of metals. Likewise, even though our atomic age had its origin in the New Mexico desert, when a new ray, brighter than the New Mexico sun, lit up the landscape, even though the toll of human life that followed in Japan shocked the sensibilities of the warring world, we look forward to a new age of power and plenty with new servants to do man's work and to raise the standard of living throughout the world.

There is in this new atomic power one additional hopeful element. It took our aboriginal ancestors generation upon generation to learn to tame the energy of fire, but we in this great scientific era have a right to believe the acceleration which we see on all sides today in the growth of technology may be matched, at least to some extent, by an acceleration in the rate at which men of different national origins may learn to meet together in a common need to bring under control and put to beneficial use the immense forces of atomic energy.

This has been a harsh chapter in the history of our world. This new power which promises so much has thus far increased some of our problems and, if we look only at the surface, has made more difficult the eventual arrival of worldwide peace and the utilization throughout the earth of nuclear power.

The conviction is growing that disarmament, the sense in which it was proposed and may have been possible from 1945 to 1948, has now become impossible. There was once a day when a rigid system of inspection could have prevented the growth of dangerous stockpiles of fissionable materials for military use, but in the last decade the sizes of stockpiles held by the principal atomic powers have presumably grown large enough that substantial amounts could be secreted before any inspection system begins, and would be adequate for a devastating attack if one of the powers so chose. But wholly apart from this question of secreted materials before initiating inspection, it might be recognized that even if that did not occur and a rigid inspection system and control of materials were imposed, then still in the event of war, the facilities which have grown up for peacetime uses of atomic energy are of such productive capacity that it would not be long after the outbreak of war that adequate materials would have been produced for full scale atomic devastation.

Moreover, we should not restrict ourselves merely to consideration of hazards implicit in wars of annihilation with atomic weapons. In technology applied to military ends, novelty is ever a prime goal. Thus there is the probability that a war between major powers will lead to types of destruction of a nature and scope not yet conceived, much less demonstrated.

Modern war makes certain for all participants their near annihilation and makes military conquest utterly illogical and absurd. The great powers of today thus find themselves in a sort of uneasy stalemate. Each is concerned with maintaining heavy retaliatory forces to insure that the other dare not risk the gamble of military conquest; but in turn dares not risk it on his own save as a result of monstrous blunder.

While much time will pass before we work our way out of our current military stalemate, certainly it is a hazardous stalemate which no one likes, and it may have merit only if we use the time it provides to take advantage of the evident value of peaceful collaboration on projects of common concern. Says the editor of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, "Atomic deadlock can have positive value only if man uses the breathing spell it provides to develop a permanent foundation for peace without terror."

On the one hand we may strive to use this period for creating mutual respect for, and consent to use, the machinery of an expanded and strengthened United Nations to mediate international disputes, and to diminish tensions arising from international rivalries. On the other hand, we may move toward direct collaboration on technical projects for which the high level of modern technology makes such cooperation unusually productive and beneficial to all concerned.

Here I would like to mention several projects which seem especially appropriate for joint developments in world laboratories. But before doing so, let us look at some road blocks in that path.

Restrictions on free travel and free exchange of information have become increasingly irksome in recent years. These restrictions have fallen heavily on many scientists, on people in the arts, on businessmen, sometimes on religious leaders or other people whose interests and pursuits are not confined by national borders. The justification of these restrictions is the implicit argument that somehow they increase the national security and well-being of the Nation that applies them. But today with the rapid approach of the time when any country which launches atomic warfare can create untold damage at will, we need to examine whether we can remove many of our restrictions on free travel and exchange of information. We need to encourage, by whatever means we can, the spirit of international cooperation and openness which will minimize the chances of a misunderstanding—an accidental spark that would lead to disaster.

One step we can take in this direction is to remove our present restrictions on transmission of nonsecret scientific information between nations. The United States has helped to foster such restrictions but their contribution to our security is open to question. We know that such measures foster fear and suspicion rather than cooperation and understanding. They decrease the rate of gain of knowledge which is at the maximum only when free communication exists. Physical truths cannot be protected by such policies. They are everywhere the same—equally measurable in any laboratory.

We can break down barriers in communications still further by encouraging an expansion in our present system of exchange of teachers and students between nations. Most of our American universities do not have visiting professors from other lands on their facilities but would be happy to have them. Many of our own scientists go abroad to study and teach in foreign institutions. They come back with new ideas, a fresher outlook on their own problems which cannot help but be of benefit to science as a whole. An increase in opportunities for exchange of faculty and students between our great institutions of learning would be an important integrating factor in our pursuit of knowledge. We have plenty of disintegrating influences; we need men and women who are concerned with mutual problems and prepared to dedicate themselves to their solution.

The importance of the international meetings of the kind being held here in Rochester cannot be overemphasized. Information exchanged between participants will hasten the day when science will understand the secrets of the nucleus and of fundamental particles, and move man another step forward in his understanding of the universe about him.

A further measure we might well undertake now to promote a spirit of international cooperation would be the establishment of a world passport, which would be granted annually to a select list of nominees from all over the world. Such a passport would permit its holder to travel freely in lands of all member nations. A list of

nominees for this honor would be prepared by a committee of participating nations, and the honor would be conferred only on those who received a unanimous vote of approval from all member nations. The list might include, for example, Nobel prize winners, outstanding artists, leaders in religion, in government, in science, in education, and in business. It could become a highly coveted award all over the world—a suitable mark of distinction for our public servants in every walk of life. Above all, it could promote a degree of mutual trust and understanding that might in the end help to halt the race for atomic arms and forestall a war that nobody wants.

A world in which restrictions on communication and on the travel of individuals has been minimized is one in which the combined intellectual and technical powers of many nations can be brought to bear in unison on common problems. We are aware of many problems which can be and should be attacked by an international effort. Even under the imperfect conditions of international communication which exist today, significant projects are under way and important beginnings have been made on others.

There is the superb example of regional cooperation illustrated by CERN, set up by the European Organization for Nuclear Research. Here men of many nations gather together for a joint assault on the experimental and theoretical problems of nuclear physics. There is likewise the inspiring scope of the International Geophysical Year. When it opens, a great network of observatories will embrace the entire earth. Chains of weather stations strung out on three meridian lines from the Arctic to the Antarctic will chart the circulation of the atmosphere during the intense period of activity spanned by the International Geophysical Year. All of the modern instruments of meteorology and geophysics will be mobilized in a global accumulation of data which should provide the basis for years of analysis, speculation, and debate. The final reduction to conclusive findings will mark a new step in man's understanding of his global home.

There is the World Health Organization which through its many laboratories and agencies is waging successful war against the diseases of mankind, and is promoting in the less fortunate areas of the world new understanding of medical care for infants, for the aged and for the handicapped.

In the atoms for peace program, there are more than 25 bilateral agreements between the United States and countries less advanced in nuclear technology.

There is a multitude of activities supported by UNESCO: its educational training centers, its support of travel for scientific and cultural reasons, its contribution to the European Organization for Nuclear Research mentioned above, the creation of the International Computation Center at Rome, the conferences in arid zone research, and the many less noticed activities of the Field Science Cooperation offices. The UNESCO 1954 participation in the U. N. technical assistance programs amounted to 56 projects in 36 countries.

These are but some of the most evident international cooperative efforts bringing the benefits of modern science and technology to peoples around the world.

We have reviewed briefly both the positive and the negative steps toward increased collaboration among scientists of different nations, as they have developed in recent years. Now let us glance at a few fields in which joint efforts may prove especially beneficial.

As a prime example of a project which involves a subject that clearly has no relevance to national boundaries, we may think of climate control or world-wide weather modification. Recent advances in meteorology suggest that efforts in this direction may pro-

duce useful results sometime in the future. Yet evidently the control of amounts of precipitation, directions of winds and like matters, are not properly planned by a single national power or even by 2 or 3 in regional collaboration. For instance, I believe that much of the weather of the United States is made along the coast of Alaska, in the Gulf of Mexico, or out in the Far Pacific, and my country has little or no control of the sea areas involved. Any regional effects on climate will have, perhaps, attenuated effects on climatic conditions in most distant areas. Moreover, such information as we now have strongly implies that the most effective weather control requires coordinated efforts over vast areas of the earth's surface, and the broader the cooperation, the greater might be the results.

Another example on a large scale which inevitably crosses national boundaries is the project to send a rocket into outer space. Purely from a geographical viewpoint, efforts to send missiles and ultimately passengers to the moon and the nearby planets are of worldwide interest. While the intensely nationalist feelings characterizing international relations on our planet at the present time suggest that we may even see, as a result of interplanetary travel, an extension of the competitive colonialism which the last century saw for the backward areas of this planet, the prospect of seeing different sections of Mars staked out by different national governments of this earth seems on the face of it ludicrous. Are we trying to play God and develop a new planet in our own image and likeness? A much more rational and probably more productive basis for the exploration and development of other worlds would be under an organization which properly reflects the common interests of all the peoples of this earth in such development. The Man in the Moon belongs to the children of every country, is a part of their dream world, and if reached by space ship, might better remain the property of all.

Returning now, however, from the fanciful and the future to the more immediate problems of initial efforts to get a space ship away from the earth, we recognize hazards of a rather severe sort which may arise as a result of the erroneous function of a space missile intended for the moon but which instead, through defective mechanism or planning, lands on the territory of another nation. If such a nation were at that time in an advanced state of tension in anticipation of a possible attack, this simple error might touch off the spark of world conflict.

Which brings me to the competitive race to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile. We in the American Congress have already learned that it would be a drain on all our budgets if that race should set a pattern in the whole field of space conquest. Russia and this country are working at high speed toward the attainment of an intercontinental ballistic missile, called by many "the ultimate weapon." Yet if the missile were to be attained almost simultaneously and prove to be as accurate as now forecast, if indeed it could carry atomic warheads with a striking power of several kilotons and place them within the area of a small circle, then no city in the world is safe, no jet interceptor can police the skies and no highway can promise egress from the affected area. In that day the people of the earth would banish the weapon as poison gas was outlawed in World War II, but only after the expenditure of fantastic sums of money, materials, and scientific skills.

Might it not be better to examine the chance to use space conquest as another project for an international laboratory? If we will never use this weapon once we achieve it, might it not be set aside as one segment of worldwide competition that could be surrendered to the effort to halt the race

for a full arsenal of atomic arms in every land? Or must everyone carry his own six-shooter constantly strapped to his belt?

A third area might be research on the problem of controlling thermonuclear reactions in such a way as to produce useful power. Those of you in this audience know far better than I the great amount of energy which may be released in the fusion of the lightest elements to form helium. The great abundance of heavy hydrogen or deuterium the great quantities of this valuable isotope which are contained in the world's oceans, leads to a staggering picture of power availability to lift the yoke of labor from men's shoulders throughout all the world.

It has been estimated that the amount of heavy hydrogen in the oceans is sufficient to meet world power needs at 1,000 times the present consumption and for the next million years.

There seems to me to be no other field of technology today in which there is a more evident need for pooling all of the imagination and ingenuity which the world's scientists can bring together. The riches for mankind which must flow from the solution of these problems are without parallel. The history of science dramatizes again and again that problems of special difficulty are most usually solved by the cross-fertilization of ideas from diverse sources. The effort of any one country to develop controlled thermonuclear reactors in a unilateral manner under the secrecy required by an attitude of competitive nationalism must certainly have the effect of retarding the progress of such a country in this vital field.

As many of you have been saying again and again, science cannot flourish under secrecy. The essence of the scientific process is the exchange of ideas—the comparison of procedures and the development of new ideas and techniques in an active atmosphere of collaboration in which many people may contribute small parts of the solution to produce a whole far greater than the sum of the parts. No one can yet say that the immense problems associated with development of controlled thermonuclear power will be capable of solution. What we can say, certainly, is that if their solution is available to man, then it will be most readily available and perhaps only available in an atmosphere of vigorous collaboration built upon the genius of many people from many lands. It would seem that the enlightened self-interest of all technologically advanced nations would best be served by their contributing heavily to the creation of a joint world laboratory in which the solution of these problems is sought jointly by scientists from many nations.

Some secrecy-minded individuals may object that the technology associated with each of these fields I have mentioned has possible military applications. This claim is perfectly true; however, it does not necessarily follow that the security of different nations will be furthered by developing these fields under the military security system which our competitive nationalism has imposed upon science in recent years. In fact, it may be just because of the possible military applications from these new technologies that we shall wish to develop them jointly with all principal powers participating in world laboratories created for the purpose. Perhaps we can learn an important lesson from our experiences in the development of atomic energy. The unilateral development of the field of nuclear technology has created the following dilemma. Assuming the universal desire of all peoples to achieve some sort of workable disarmament, we have nevertheless in the development of nuclear technology greatly accentuated both the need for, and the difficulty of attaining disarmament. Whereas modern atomic weapons raise the destruc-

tive potential of war to a new level, the suitability of atomic weapons for concealment and surprise use has at this advanced stage in the competition made disarmament by mutual inspection very difficult, if not impossible.

This experience in the field of nuclear technology suggests that similar potentialities exist in as yet undeveloped technologies. Research into the killing diseases of man with the objective of eliminating these diseases may bring us instead new ideas as to how we may visit death on opposing populations by new species of bacteria. Or we may find a new type of rust that will destroy his feed grains, or a virus that will kill his livestock. Successful travel in outer space will suggest new, more effective and even less detectable means of attack on other nations. Unilateral success in the field of climate control will suggest important new schemes for military action against the unfriendly powers. Project Sherwood for the development of controlled thermonuclear reactors provides the greatest promise on the horizon today of immense, cheap power sources. Yet in the event of success for this project, it takes no advanced military technician to realize that such power sources would have great applications in the engines of war. Thus we are led to feel that in every area in which the scientific method has enabled the intelligence of man to gain new mastery over nature, we face the possibility of an added complication in future disarmament efforts.

It is to that problem that I have directed these words. If the great powers find themselves in an atomic stalemate today—and I think they do—it is a carryover of patterns of national security which modern science has rendered obsolete. The military techniques which might emerge from the new areas of technology that I have been discussing can make the stalemate no worse. Already it is at a level in which any major power can precipitate almost total destruction upon an adversary (and in return upon itself) if it should make so tragic an error in judgment. Yet there is the danger that if these new areas of technology are developed in secret, some nation which at some future time is led by reckless rulers, may feel that it has gained so great a lead in some field of science that it may dare to launch an attack for world conquest. While this error in judgment will almost certainly be answered by mutual annihilation approaching totality, every effort must be bent while still we have the chance to prevent such dreadful miscalculations from occurring. Scientists, it seems to me, might suggest to the statesmen that modern technology could make the greatest contribution to the security of great powers if statesmen would move as far as possible from the secret competitive development of technologies under which we have largely operated in recent years. The scientists might urge, indeed, that the race for atomic arms could best be halted by having new fields of science developed jointly by all nations.

The responsibility for carrying forward the proposals here made for cooperative studies of weather modification and for world laboratories of science, must be placed with some international organization. A natural agency for this purpose is the United Nations. Such responsibility, such new avenues for accomplishing good, will strengthen and expand the capacity of the United Nations for reaching its goal of creating a world at peace.

The procedure for implementing ideas of this nature must fit the pattern of life in each land, and therefore what we will first need will be suggestions as to possible courses of action. I hope they will be forthcoming. For my part, I intend to discuss the question with my colleagues in the United States Senate.



I hope that the United States citizens in this audience, and elsewhere, will give me their recommendations. I hope that those of you from other countries will raise the question with your associates back home, and possibly lead to official proposals from your governments to the U. N. on how best to proceed.

If we do succeed, then no nation can make the fatal error of assuming that it has an overwhelming technical lead over a possible adversary. The recent Geneva Atoms-for-Peace Conference illustrated how similar the achievements were in different nations even though each had pursued its program of research and development in careful secrecy. Such similarity of development will no doubt be the case in the future in arms as well as peaceful atoms.

My own experience at Geneva persuades me that many nations know a lot about the atom. When India's Dr. Bhabha opened the pie of thermonuclear power, the blackbirds from 4 and 20 lands began to sing! What was secret at breakfast was table talk at lunch. Nations rushed to hold press conferences and attend activities. Isn't it possible that there might be a similar pattern in weapons, and that no one nation holds all the cards?

Something new seems to be needed in this disarmament business. The nations make little headway in finding grounds for agreement on reducing the size of armies or destroying parts of atomic stockpiles. Very well; why not try to think constructively about disarmaments in potential weapons, in "ultimate weapons." The problems here are simpler because no one nation has so strong a vested interest in the new field that it will be contributing much more than valuable scientific help. It would be a new try at disarmament, this "disarming the future," and it would lack some of the defects of proposals for present disarmament.

This is not a suggestion that all nations pool their efforts in the field of present atomic technology, nor a hint that the testing of atomic weapons be stopped by any of the great powers, and surely not a proposal that Oak Ridge, Hanford, Livermore and Los Alamos be levelled to the ground. It springs rather from the feeling that the new technologies may displace the old, and that a war-weary world might achieve in time a form of disarmament by obsolescence.

If and when that day should dawn, each new technology would no longer be a source of dread power to be somehow kept from destroying us in the convulsion of global war. Rather it would become what men of science have always intended—a means for opening up a new dimension in human life for defining a greater destiny for the forward course of the human spirit.

You men of science labor in that vineyard. May God add strength to your endeavors.

## Dissolution of Cominform Means Nothing

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Russia's announcement that the Cominform has been dissolved actually means very little. The Communist information bureau which was established in Warsaw 9

years ago actually has been inactive since 1949.

The significant point to keep in mind is that abolishing the Cominform has not changed in any way the complete and total loyalty of the Communist Parties in various countries throughout the world to the Soviet Union. The Red organizations in other countries blindly follow every twist and turn of the Soviet line and owe their first loyalty to Russia. The men in the Kremlin despite their change in tactics have not given up their hopes of world domination.

Recent events as well as observations made on my trip to the Soviet Union and five satellite countries last fall convince me that we are entering into one of the most dangerous and demanding periods in world history. It was much easier to keep our guard up when the Russian-led Communist movement was engaging in aggression and obvious subversion to destroy human freedom. The snarling Red tiger is often less dangerous than the smiling Red tiger.

It is imperative that we keep in mind that the Communist conspiracy continues to follow the Soviet objectives in all political problems and aids and abets Russian intelligence services throughout the world.

We must now recognize that the new Russian approach will be much more palatable to nations in the West, including our own, than previous Soviet policy. We must now prepare ourselves to accept a greater responsibility than ever in leading the free world in this more relaxed and at the same time more dangerous Russian approach. We must accept this new challenge by the Communists to compete with us more readily in diplomatic and economic fields.

## Independence of Israel

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1956, by the Jewish calendar, Israel was 8 years old and its people can well take pride in that fact. I wish to extend my sincere felicitations to the people of Israel, President Ben-Gurion, and His Excellency Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, upon the occasion of the celebration of Independence Day.

The Republic of Israel emerged fully clothed with the problems and realities of political statehood on May 14, 1948. During these short years of independence the two main preoccupations of Israel have been economic development of the country and the establishment by diplomatic and military means of the security of the country within the boundaries set by the armistice agreement.

The State of Israel is a product of an ancient dream, of suffering, courage, faith, and sacrifice of a people striving to

create a new democracy and to live in peace. There are few historic parallels for the present resurgence of faith in democratic values witnessed in Israel. Israel's faith is everywhere in evidence in the energy of its manifold activities and in a rapidly accumulating array of solid achievements along social, economic, political, and spiritual lines. The triumph of the human spirit in Israel over seemingly endless and overwhelming obstacles is a constant beacon light of faith to all men.

Because Israel is small and poor in natural resources it faces towering economic problems. The economy of Israel is still in the process of building healthy foundations for a normal existence. The economic policy of the government is characterized by the encouragement of healthy economic enterprise in all its beneficial forms. In economic matters Israel has steered a middle and nondoc-trinaire course between the totalitarian economics of the slave states and the typical laissez faire of the 19th century. It is developing an indigenous blend of free enterprise and free government suited to its own particular problems.

The Middle East is the crossroads of the Old World, the bridge between Europe, Asia, and Africa, straddling global air and sea routes, the Dardenelles and the Suez Canal. Within the Middle East the State of Israel is clearly the heartland of the crossroads. The present masters of the Kremlin, following the lead of past military conquerors, covet this position. The deeply disputatious question of peace with the Arab States leaves the political future clouded. Yet within Israel there is energy and optimism, for here at last a dream of centuries for a homeland has become a political reality.

The avowed aim of the United States is to promote the political and economic stability of the entire region of the Middle East with a course of action based on neither favoritism nor on prejudice, but on the principle of safeguarding the best interests of the United States and the free world. The United States has given increasing attention to ways of reducing tension along the troubled frontiers of the Middle East. The most serious threat of this continued strife, from the free-world point of view, is the danger it presents to the Middle East as a whole. Seeking new directions for further Communist exploitation, the masters of the Kremlin already are looking upon the troubled waters of Palestine as a good spot for launching their next dangerous activities.

If our worldwide position is to be secure, we must recognize the potentialities of Israel as an outpost for western civilization. The whole Arab world is in a state of underdevelopment and extreme poverty. Its populations are restive and if practical solution to the miseries of millions of people do not come, Communists will certainly make the most of their opportunity.

If we in the Western World ignore the Middle East and its unsolved human problems, we shall not only have failed a large section of humanity, but we shall

have mortally weakened our own defenses of the West and its message of freedom. We can strike no more effective blow in defense of our way of life on a global basis than to do everything possible to make Israel a strong bastion of freedom in the Middle East and through it to reach the rest of the region in the true spirit of our freedom. And, further, we must cooperate in all wholesome economic endeavors of the entire Middle East.

### Letter to the President

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BEN F. JENSEN**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday forenoon, April 16, about 2 hours before I learned the President had vetoed the farm bill, I delivered to him by special messenger, the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1956.

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am quite certain you will remember all that took place during the fall of 1952, when at your request, the writer was called to Denver, Colo., to debate the 90 percent of parity question vs. flexible parity with a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation in your presence. I need not remind you of your decision and of the outcome of that debate, but will only say it was most gratifying to a great majority of our farmers, and was reflected in the election of 1952. Hence, as a humble Representative of the American people, I feel dutybound to again speak out on this subject which is of such great importance to every American, as well as to our farmers.

I sincerely hope you will sign the farm bill because:

1. The farmer's dollar is now worth only 80 cents at the counter, which our American economy cannot long endure.

2. The 90 percent of parity provision would immediately raise farmer income, hence their purchasing power and in turn would benefit industries and labor, now and over the long pull.

3. When the American farmer dollar buys 100 cents worth at the counter, he buys over twice as many dollars' worth of processed and manufactured goods on an average than do other Americans per capita.

4. Most everyone favors the soil bank provision, for obvious reasons.

5. The bill embodies about 90 percent of your own nine point farm program, both in principle and purpose.

6. The American people are today spending on an average of less than 24 percent of their income for food, which is less than at any time in our history, except when a number of foods were subsidized during World War II. We must weigh a slight price increase in finished goods against millions of jobs now in jeopardy.

7. When the threat of lower prices of raw products is eliminated, then the thousands of processors and manufacturers of raw products will know they can safely purchase a year's supply of their raw products needs

(amounting to billions of dollars annually) without financial loss if the parity provisions now in the bill are maintained. For the past 3 years they have been buying from hand to mouth, either from the producer or from the Government surpluses, due to the threat of lower raw product prices under the flexible parity proposal, which is the primary cause for the piling up of surpluses in Government warehouses and grain bins, instead of being purchased and stored by private processors and manufacturers, as should be, and will be if the parity support provisions in the farm bill are made law by your signature.

Therefore, I plead with you to sign the farm bill.

Respectfully,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I yield to no man in the high regard and respect I hold for our great President, but I, too, have a duty to perform and a conscience to satisfy and live with by voting my honest convictions on every question which comes before Congress, including this veto message. For these reasons and for the reasons set out in my letter of April 16 to the President, I cannot find it in my heart to sustain the President's veto of the farm bill.

### Hon. James C. Murray's Address at the Annual Dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Held at the Mayflower Hotel on March 17, 1956

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the RECORD the stirring address of the Honorable JAMES C. MURRAY, of Illinois, delivered at the annual dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians on March 17 at the Mayflower Hotel.

The dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians is one of the finest in the country. Congressman MURRAY held the audience spellbound with his eloquence. His speech was a personal triumph and a tribute to the district which sent him to Congress and which he so ably represents. Realizing the speech with its scholarship and its message would be enjoyed by others, I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD. The speech follows:

When I received your kind invitation to speak at your outstanding St. Patrick's Day dinner, I made up my mind to be completely objective. Since an Irishman can be objective about everything except Ireland, I attempted to avoid as my topic our Emerald Isle. I thought that I might talk about our own country. When I started my address as follows—From the rock-bound coast of Maine—I had to stop because I became instantly aware of the fact that Maine was a founder of my own family and of a great Irish king.

I knew that I could not talk about Scotland because I am certain I would get into

an argument with my Scotch constituents when they learned that Scotland comes from the word "Scotia"—as Ireland was originally called—which was settled, in part, by St. Columba.

To avoid controversy, I skipped over England, although I paused briefly enough to observe that the only extant manuscript of the earliest English epic Beowulf was written in Gaelic lettering. If I were to talk upon France, I would have to dwell on St. Columbanus' monasteries at Luxeuil—and in Italy, at Bobbio, which were the principal centers of the reconversion in education made by Irish monks of a Europe lapsed in barbarism. If I were to dwell on Switzerland, or for that matter, in any country up to the Ukrainian, I would find evidence of Irish teachers and missionaries.

Being thus frustrated in my attempts to find something to speak about other than Ireland, I decided to make my oration an objective speech about the Irish from the Celtic viewpoint. One of the gifts that St. Patrick secured for our race prior to his death was the promise that no son of Erin would experience the horrors preceding the destruction of the world. It would seem from this prophecy that some time prior to the end of the world, the last Irishman would have passed away.

If an historian at that time were to attempt to write the history of the Irish and were to predicate his history upon the Irish as pictured by present-day columnists, radio announcers, and other such organs of public information, I am afraid we would have a very misconstrued picture of ourselves.

I sometimes wonder whether or not the picture painted of the Irish by present-day organs of propaganda is one founded on jealousy, or aimed at the destruction of the things that an Irishman stands for. Since our basic virtue is spiritual rather than material, I am convinced the reason is the latter.

Oftentimes I wonder whether we ourselves, in our attempts to enjoy God's world, realize what we stand for. For the purpose of setting the record straight, if not to advise you of your birthright, and the obligations it entails, I would like to relate our Irish inheritance.

Biblical scholars tell us that we sprang from 1 of the 10 lost sons of Jacob. I don't know whether this is correct, but I do recall a song my grandfather used to sing which indicated that the Irish made the passover from Egypt to Israel with Moses. It goes like this: "It must have been the Irish that swam the River Nile because only an Irishman would fight a crocodile."

Anthropologists relate that we came from the stone-age hunters and fishermen which might be the basis for our stone throwing and tall tale telling ability. Bronze-age scholars related that our ancestors' gold and copper gave Ireland a preeminent position in early commercial and artistic world.

Regardless of what the early pages of history might have disclosed of an Irishman, we know the principal reason for our existence finds its source in our Apostle—St. Patrick. It is the love of God in every Irishman instilled by our Apostle and nurtured by our martyrs that is the divine spring from which flows the greatness of our race. From this divine fountain flows the love of individual liberty which has dedicated Irish everywhere to its cause. From it springs our saints, our missionaries, clergy, teachers, patriots and mothers.

Our birthright has proven to be the most formidable armor against every attack—against godliness or individual liberty—regardless of its form. Greater than the atom, our heritage is an indestructible eternity.

That which makes us Irish has been subject to every conceivable assault since its



inspiration. Cromwell attempted to destroy it by military might but succeeded only in fostering it. Others attempted to suppress it by legislation but merely nurtured it. Today we face the most subtle attack ever hurled at our birthright. It is not hurled only at us as Irishmen—but as children of God. It is the assault of Satan's stepson who chose as his birthplace and growth the one place on the face of the earth not visited by our missionaries and patriots—Red Russia.

Its subtleness is most dangerous because it attempts to undermine our spiritualness by appealing to our worldliness. Our vices are encouraged, our virtues discouraged. Our humor stressed, our compassion depressed. Our intemperance glamorized, our estheticism criticized. Our vanity appeased, our meekness derided. Our pride fostered, our humility starved. Our earthliness praised, our love of God taunted.

To those of you who might feel that we as Irishmen have not the strength or wherewithal to meet this latest and greatest assault made against that which an Irishman stands for, I would like to recall some of the contributions that our ancestors, fathers, brothers, and even sons and daughters made to the liberty under God represented by our own great country.

Historians approximate that one-third of Washington's army were of Irish descent, so you see we were here a great many years prior to any "potato famine." The only reason that there are not more of our wives in the DAR is because we were too busy building railroads and developing our country to keep track of our ancestors.

The founder of our Navy was an Irishman, as you all know. The early builder of the present-day Democratic Party—Andrew Jackson—was an Irishman.

As a matter of fact, one of the Congressmen wrote me that St. Patrick must have been a Democrat.

The greatest award given by this country for individual contribution to its cause is the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is an

award presented for acts of bravery actually performed and not inspired in the mind of a competent press agent. The very creation of the Medal of Honor was inspired by deeds of an Irishman in the Civil War—Maj. Gen. Phillip Kearney.

The first deed for which a Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded was a deed performed by a native Irishman during Indian warfare in the settling of the West—the name of that distinguished son of Erin was Col. Bernard J. D. Irwin, an M. D.

Over two-thirds of the Congressional Medal of Honor winners who were born on foreign soil were born in Ireland—this despite the fact that Ireland is comparatively a small country.

In recent years the deeds of our brothers, sons, and daughters in behalf of our country occupy as prominent a place in our history as did the deeds of their forebears. The first American bombardier to sink a Japanese ship in World War II was an Irishman. The first American to kill a Jap in World War II was an Irish-American. The first American flier to bag five airplanes in World War II was an American of Irish descent by the name of Edward O'Hara.

The first American to be eulogized by the President for bravery in World War II was an American of Irish extraction. The first American Coastguardsman to catch a spy, had Erin's blood flowing in his veins. And the first American to make himself a human torpedo was another of our kinfolk.

Although our War Department does not classify data on the basis of nationality, the Irish War Veterans, United States of America, have estimated that during World War II, 3½ million persons of Irish or part-Irish descent served in our Armed Forces.

I did not intend to bring any message to you, but if there is any message contained in this address, it is merely to urge you to be more Irish—for being more Irish—you will be more American. And being better Americans, you will have successfully borne the obligations required of your emerald inheritance.

## Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year I prepared a questionnaire of public opinion on many issues and questions of national importance for circulation in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent. When I undertook the task, it was my desire to obtain a random sample of opinion which might demonstrate local feelings on these issues and questions. A total of 4,435 of the questionnaires were returned to me by April 1 and were tabulated.

The 15th Congressional District of Ohio is in many ways typical of America. Its interests are diverse. It has farms, large and small. There are located there many factories engaged in the production of a multitude of products. The area is a storehouse of natural resources. The people are thinking people, vitally interested in the affairs of the day. Since the people of these seven counties have such diversified interests, it is my feeling that the answers are those of typical Americans, free from the extremes of sectionalism and provincialism. I regard their answers as a source of valuable guidance on various issues as they are considered. Others in the Congress may also share my great interest in the results of this poll.

The tabulation is as follows:

	Total vote	Number favoring	Percentage favoring
1. Do you support the Bricker amendment to void treaties insofar as they would abridge the sovereignty of the United States?	3,692	2,916	79
2. Do you favor lowering the legal voting age from 21 to 18?	4,340	1,657	38.2
3. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would prevent the Federal Government from spending more than it receives in revenues during peacetime?	4,237	3,132	73.9
4. Are you in agreement with the present foreign policy of the United States?	3,540	1,880	53.1
5. Do you favor the admission of Communist China to the United Nations?	4,222	340	8
6. Do you favor continuation of technical assistance to underdeveloped nations?	2,973	1,988	66.9
7. Do you favor continuation of military assistance to friendly nations?	3,875	2,847	73.5
8. If answers to questions 6 and 7 are "yes", where do you think aid should be concentrated? Increase (1,307—60.5 percent) or decrease (851—39.5 percent) aid to Asia. Increase (638—30.8 percent) or decrease (1,438—69.2 percent) aid to Europe.	3,994	2,295	57.5
9. Should we continue the United States Information Agency which furnishes information about our Nation and its policies to other countries?	3,797	2,341	61.6
10. Do you favor the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service by our Government to train future diplomats?	4,225	2,090	49.5
11. Do you favor Federal aid to education for the construction of public school buildings to be supported by additional tax measures?	4,187	1,580	37.7
12. Do you favor increased Federal aid for new highways financed by increased taxes (on gasoline, tires, etc.) for highway users?	4,229	2,377	56.2
13. Do you believe the minimum wage laws should be extended to fields of employment not now covered?	3,986	2,474	62.1
14. Do you favor the administration's health reinsurance proposal whereby the Federal Government would encourage expansion of private health insurance by assuming exceptional risks?	3,891	1,542	39.6
15. Do you support increasing present old age and survivorship benefits under the Social Security Act?	4,255	3,022	71
16. Do you favor the reduction from age 65 to 62 for women to receive benefits under the social security law?	4,314	3,132	72.6
17. Do you favor the construction of additional public housing units?	3,889	1,307	33.6
18. Which farm program do you favor: (a) Price support program based on 90 percent parity with acreage restrictions. (b) Price support program based on flexible parity with acreage restrictions. (c) No Federal price supports and no crop controls.		617	16.7
19. Do you support the elimination of Federal taxes on gasoline consumed by farmers in the operation of farm machinery?	4,215	2,495	59.2
20. Do you agree that we must abolish farm surpluses before the reduction in farm prices can be solved?	3,833	2,736	71.4
21. Do you support the President's proposal for a soil bank to transfer acreage from farm production to soil-improvement crops as a means to reduce surplus production?	3,900	2,647	67.7
22. Do you agree with the President's recommendation that family-size farms should receive greater consideration in crop price support payments than large commercial farms?	4,103	3,642	88.8
23. Do you favor legislation to remove acreage restrictions on wheat which is grown and used for feed or seed on a particular farm?	3,915	3,110	79.6
24. Do you favor increased postal rates on first-class mail as a means to decrease the deficit under which the Post Office Department has operated?	4,155	2,237	53.8
25. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii and Alaska? Alaska only, 212 (6.3 percent); Hawaii only, 122 (3.6 percent).	3,359	2,904	86.4
26. Do you favor a policy of lower tariffs even though it results in increased competition with domestic industry?	3,946	490	23.6
27. Do you favor a reduction in Federal income taxes without first balancing the budget and decreasing the national debt?	4,114	870	21.1
28. Do you favor a basic pension for all World War I veterans?	3,963	2,198	55.5
29. Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?	3,738	3,246	86.8

## The Farm Bill

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1956.

It precisely and concisely states the situation with respect to the farm bill. It points out how once again the Democrat Party has made the farm problem a political football at the expense of the farmers.

I am also inserting the statement I released to the press on the veto message:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1956]

#### THE FARM ISSUE REDEFINED

When the Democrats in Congress cooked up their vote buying monstrosity in place of the workable farm program that the President submitted early in January, they must have thought they were dealing with another Dewey. They expected that if Mr. Eisenhower did veto their bill, he would thereafter sit quietly while they told the farmers about all of the wealth that would have been poured on them if it had not been for a callous Republican President.

The Democrats miscalculated. In his speech to the Nation, explaining why he had to veto the farm bill, President Eisenhower demonstrated that the moral courage that prompted the veto is fighting courage as well. He brought forth a sound alternative program, salvaging what he could from Democratic sabotage and delay.

Now the burden of action has been shifted to the Democratic majority in Congress. If its members do not enact the President's recommendations, it is they who must accept responsibility for failure to provide relief for American farmers.

Mr. Eisenhower said he would call a special session of Congress to meet after the national conventions if an acceptable farm program is not enacted before that time. The proposals he put forward Monday evening have been thoroughly discussed. They were, in fact, embodied in the farm bill he vetoed, but were rendered unworkable by the discredited high price-support plan that the Democrats tacked onto that bill.

Twice on Monday, in his veto message and again in his address to the citizens, President Eisenhower exposed the fraud of the high price supports that the Democrats seek to perpetuate. They are the source of the unmanageable surpluses that are depressing farm prices and driving American agriculture toward socialism.

His soil-bank plan was designed to reduce these surpluses and still support farm income by paying farmers to rest and improve acres that are not needed for present production. Because the Democrats paltered so long with the farm bill in Congress, the time has passed when that plan can be put in effect this year, even though the vetoed bill provided for it.

The President proposed that he be authorized, nevertheless, to pay 50 percent of the soil-bank benefits to any farmer who signed to observe land conservation practices next year. These payments could be made any time after July 1, and as Mr. Eisenhower

pointed out, would enable farmers to buy the seed, trees, fertilizers, and new machinery they might need to start preparing their land for soil-bank use.

All that is required is that Congress pass the soil-bank bill, unencumbered by the nostrums that evoked the veto on Monday. If the Democrats fail to do this, it is they who must answer to the farmers for the callous disregard that candidates Stevenson and Kefauver have been piping about.

This is by no means the best possible farm program. It will defer for a full year the job of cutting farm surpluses. But it is the best that can be achieved at this time after the Democrats have played politics with the problem for more than 3 months.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS, REPUBLICAN WHIP, 17TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, ON FARM BILL VETO RECORD

It is obvious from the President's veto and his message that he is thinking solely in terms of what is best for the welfare of our farmers and the country as a whole.

The bill sent the President by the Democrat-controlled Congress, after long, costly delay, is purely a political measure, not a cure to the farm problem but a political narcotic to try to fool the farmers.

President Eisenhower recognized it as such. He will not play politics with the welfare of agriculture. Once again by vetoing this bill President Eisenhower demonstrated his statesmanlike greatness. I am sure his action has the overwhelming approval of the majority of our farmers.

If an attempt should be made to override the veto, I am sure it will fail. I, for one, will vote against any motion to override.

It is now the duty and the responsibility of the Congress to act immediately on the soil-bank proposal. As the President points out this can be done in a few days, if the Democrat leadership will permit, and stop all this political maneuvering.

## War-Risk Insurance for Aircraft

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Department of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft.

The usual commercial insurance policy does not cover aircraft against war risk in the event of outbreak of hostilities. Air carriers are, therefore, reluctant to permit their aircraft to venture into potential danger areas.

Lack of adequate insurance protection would jeopardize mobilization of the country's air-transport facilities in case of an emergency. For these reasons, in 1951 the Congress enacted title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act to authorize the Department of Commerce to issue binders insuring United States aircraft against war risk in the event of an outbreak of hostilities. This authority will expire on June 14, 1956. The Department has informed me that, if legislation extending this authority for 5 years is approved, binder fees will more than

cover expenses chargeable to the war-risk-insurance fund under peacetime operations. If the program should go into operation in time of war, it is anticipated that premiums would keep the insurance fund self-sustaining.

Enactment of the legislation therefore would insure our civil air fleet against loss from war risks with little likelihood of any need for significant appropriations to the war-risk-insurance fund. The Department of Commerce urges early enactment of this legislation to keep the civil air fleet covered by war-risk insurance without danger of lapse.

## Farm Legislation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, rigid farm price supports in the 1956 farm bill vetoed by President Eisenhower would have kept the farmers' incomes high in an election year, it is true, but it encouraged costly overproduction for increased storage at the expense of all the people. As usual, the President did the right thing.

After all, the domestic parity plan for wheat alone would have cost consumers in increased grocery bills almost \$350 million. All food products containing wheat would have gone up in price. Bread would have gone up about 2 cents a loaf. Also, under the two-price plan for rice, its retail price would have increased at least 2 cents a pound. Low income city families would be doubly subsidizing the farmer.

The results of rigid supports have been high food prices plus high taxes for payments and cost of loans and cost of storage of surpluses.

The farmer, like any other group, has a right to expect protection from all-out distress, but farmers should not expect their Government to return to a barren program which created and was responsible for the basic trouble.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the administration's soil-bank plan would cut surpluses and yet boost farm income. The delay in enacting this program into law in time for this year's planting is not the administration's fault. But the President's suggestion of advance payments to the farmers to alleviate their distress should help to overcome part of the effects of the delay of this Democrat-controlled Congress.

The farm bill as voted by Congress as President Eisenhower said was a bad bill for all the people of the country. In the interests of my constituents and consumers generally, that is why I voted against it.

By the same reasoning, I am voting to sustain the President's veto.

But I will vote to help the farmer because that is what the soil-bank plan will



do, but not by adding the cost to the consumer's food bill.

I urge immediate action on the soil-bank plan recommended by the President to reduce surpluses and prevent distress prices.

### Syria Celebrates Evacuation Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute the people of Syria. His Excellency Shukri al-Quwwatli, President of the Republic of Syria, and His Excellency Dr. Farid Zeineddine, the Ambassador of Syria, on the occasion of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of Evacuation Day, April 17, 1956.

Before 1920 the Republic of Syria in its present boundaries had no separate history of its own. Despite centuries of subjugation to the Ottoman Empire, Syria, like other Arab countries, played a notable part in the shaping of modern Arab history. From the middle of the 19th century to the second decade of the 20th century—the period of the “Arab awakening” and the struggle against the Ottomans—Syria played a leading role in determining the aims and objects of the rise of nationalism in the Arab world.

Syrian proclamation of independence on March 18, 1920, announced to the whole world her determination to remain a free and independent country. This act, although short-lived, marked the climax of the Arab national movement and the farthest point of success reached in the partial realization of Arab national aims. The strangling of Syria's first period of independence was engendered by the conflicting interests of the so-called big powers of the era. High hopes of the period of independence dimmed and the fight against the two-fold foreign domination of the Arab countries initiated a struggle which is continued today in some parts of the Arab world.

Syrian history from 1920 to 1946 is that of a desperate and bitter national struggle. The changes in the international scene influenced the crisis in Syria. Making full use of the special circumstances of the Second World War, Syria succeeded in obtaining recognition of her complete independence and in achieving the evacuation of all foreign troops from the country. The increased pressure of the Syrian nationalists forced the mandate authorities to restore constitutional life to the country. In July 1943 elections were held and Syria's second nationalist regime was established. His Excellency Shukri al-Quwwatli became President of the Republic of Syria. During the period of this regime evacuation took place—one of the outstanding events in Syria's history after the achievement of independence. Force was met with force and the Army of the mandate power was expelled from the

country. The death knell of imperialism in Syria was tolled when finally on April 17, 1946, the United Nations approved by a large majority of votes the evacuation of all foreign troops from Syria.

Other Syrian successes in this period included her participation in the field of international politics. The Syrian Government in 1945 joined the Allied cause. Following this, Syria was invited to participate in the San Francisco conference where she signed the charter of the United Nations as one of the first members of the organization, achieving thereby the status of a free and fully sovereign state.

Syria has made notable contributions to culture and civilization. In the course of many centuries, Arab Syria has produced eminent poets, men of letters, jurists, historians, scientists, and journalists who made great contributions to world culture. Syria has also transmitted to the West the philosophy and sciences of the ancient world, serving thereby as a bridge over which the cultures of the ancient Greeks, Persians, Romans, and Indians passed to Europe and America.

Syrians today are eager to keep step with the progress of modern civilization. Education is being fostered, books are being translated, and the ancient heritage of Arabic culture is being recovered. Syria's institutions of higher learning, for example Syrian University and the Arab Academy of Damascus, proceed along western patterns. Through these and other channels the learning of the West is being translated, digested, and introduced to the country. Valuable research projects and studies are being conducted on a scale that promises well for the cultural future of Syria.

The Syrian struggle for liberty served as a symbol to other oppressed peoples in the world. In the words of today's Syrian leaders:

The people of Syria are content and gratified that their struggle for political independence has been accompanied by a parallel fight for the liberation of the country from feudal and reactionary forces and for the achievement of a social, economic, and cultural revival which, it is hoped, will ultimately bring great good to all Arabs, will strengthen the people's social consciousness and will secure for the country the benefits of a true democratic rule, based on the great principle of government by the people and for the interest of the people.

### Some Aspects of Law in the Atomic Age

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 16, the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association asked me to discuss some aspects of law in the atomic age.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ASPECTS OF LAW IN THE ATOMIC AGE  
(Address of Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

I appreciate the opportunity to talk this morning to you members of the bar. It is hardly a unique experience for me as a layman to address a group of lawyers. Well over one-half of the Members of the United States Senate are members of the legal profession and I find occasion to talk with and to them at times. My task this morning, however, does present a novel opportunity, for I plan to discuss with you some of the problems which as lawyers you will face in the atomic age. I will be pleased if at the conclusion of my remarks you are convinced that a man cannot live for a lifetime as a business man, farmer, and public official without absorbing portions of the learned advice of his counsel.

Until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the interest of the organized bar in the development of the Nation's atomic energy program was almost nonexistent. With a few notable exceptions the legal profession gave scant attention to this most important matter, and the contributions which lawyers customarily make to public affairs here lagged behind that which accompanied other current developments. That atomic energy prior to 1954 had a limited impact upon the law is understandable in the light of the conditions of the predominantly Government-financed operations which then existed. Only the patent bar to a limited extent and the lawyers for the Atomic Energy Commission and its principal contractors had a real professional interest in the subject.

This is not the situation today. The 1954 act opened the door to private initiative and set the framework for the development of a complex atomic energy industry. Lawyers can no longer remain detached or aloof, and it is not surprising to find the bar now playing an interested and substantial role in the growth of the country's program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Thus, the American Bar Association now has a special committee on atomic energy, and at its last annual meeting received some one-half dozen papers dealing with atomic-energy matters. The organized bar associations of the cities of New York and Chicago have active committees on atomic energy law. The Federal Bar Association last fall conducted a 2-day briefing session in Washington on atomic energy, attended to capacity by lawyers from all sections of the country. Leading law schools now conduct seminars on legal problems in atomic energy. The Bar Journals and Law Reviews contain an increasing number of articles on the subject. The current issue of Duke University's Law and Contemporary Problems is devoted entirely to legal problems in the development of atomic power. I have been informed that a forthcoming issue of the Texas Law Journal will also be devoted entirely to the subject.

Various approaches have been taken toward the subject of atomic energy and its legal problems. One extreme has been that atomic energy has brought about a strange “brave new world” with an entirely different set of problems than exist in any other field, and given rise to a separate body of atomic energy law capable of being understood only by an esoteric group of specialists. The other extreme is that atomic energy problems are no different from any others and can be dealt with accordingly under traditional patterns.

I prefer a middle course which recognizes pragmatically that there are some unique aspects present, but also recognizes the feasi-

bility of applying and adapting traditional doctrine to these new situations. Thus, we may hope to approach the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the pattern of normal private enterprise, recognizing that there will be unique aspects in this field which give rise to an active role by the Government.

The uniqueness of atomic energy lies in its nature and in its sources in uranium and thorium metals. Here is a new natural resource of substantial proportions, capable of destruction in devastating proportions, but capable also of achieving the more abundant life for all mankind.

For reasons of national defense, the development of this resource became a national monopoly for bomb-production purposes. Federal ownership of fissionable material (or special nuclear material as it is now known) has been continued under the Atomic Energy Acts of 1946 and 1954 because of security and other considerations. Legally, therefore, we are dealing with a resource which is Government property. And I can assure you that the accountability for this material even transcends that to which normal Government-issued property is subject.

Seriously though, we are dealing with more problems than that of Government property in the narrow sense. We are dealing with a Government-owned, contractor-operated industry of very large proportions. We are also dealing with a parallel-growing, privately financed industry which will operate under Government regulation. At the present time we are in a transition stage with the Government acting as a proprietor, promoter, and regulator.

The legal problems of atomic energy stem from these Government roles. I want to emphasize this morning the newer problems under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, particularly in the privately financed development of atomic energy.

However, I would stress that a very substantial part of the atomic industry is still Government financed. The big money is still being expended here. From a legal standpoint, there are a number of unique problems in this neglected field of the law. We have a new institution called a "Government Prime Contractor" whose operations are a sort of hybrid between private industry and direct Government operations. We have rather unique types of contractual arrangements with these prime contractors and subcontractors that do not fit standard forms. But more of that some other time.

Of primary concern to the lawyer is the fact that privately financed atomic energy activity is a regulated business—necessarily so because of two principal characteristics: first, the potential hazard to public health and safety which is involved, and, second, the presence of a paramount concern for the interests of the common defense and security. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides the broad outline of a plan for the control of essential materials and facilities. In general, the control scheme adopted has two main features: (1) A system of licensing which permits a review of proposed activities and the imposition of such conditions as may be deemed necessary, and (2) continuing supervision of a licensee through the conditions and terms included in the license, through rules and regulations, through inspections, and through reports.

Under the broad statutory power which it has over materials and facilities, the Atomic Energy Commission has issued a series of regulations and standards dealing with the detailed health, safety, and security aspects of the atomic energy business and with the rules of practice and procedure for those who seek Commission action or who are subjected to Commission orders. Students of constitutional and administrative law are familiar with the legislative technique

of delegating to an administrative agency the authority to prescribe the standards of a uniform regulatory scheme, when the field requires special knowledge, or the hand of an expert, but leaving that flexibility which is necessary or desirable.

There is nothing unique in this application of the general rules and principles of administrative law in the field of atomic energy. However, the atomic energy lawyer must be familiar, not only with the statute and the rules and regulations, but must also acquire, for complete understanding, knowledge of the technical implications which are involved. This, in turn, may require the acquisition of a new and somewhat strange vocabulary.

Another field of interest to the lawyer is that associated with international trade in atomic energy goods and services. American industry, with the lead given by the Manhattan project in the war years and by the Government's research and development program since then, should enjoy a competitive advantage in the world's atomic market place. This is particularly true with respect to the manufacturers of reactors, reactor components, high-level radiation sources, control devices, and instruments of all sorts. It is also true of architect-engineers and others who may be employed to perform consulting services for foreign countries or their nationals.

Here the lawyer will need more than an acquaintance with the rules of international trade generally. To serve his client well, he will need in addition a knowledge and understanding of the United States program for cooperative assistance with the free world in atomic energy matters. Among other things, this will involve knowledge of the bilateral agreements for cooperation which we have with other nations, the substance of their provisions, and the limitations which are imposed in the interest of the common defense and security. It will require an understanding of the important matter of supplying fuel for foreign reactors, the allocations which have been made, the policy and procedures which are applicable, and the type of private international arrangements permitted. Comprehension of these matters cannot be acquired through the traditional sources of law but must be derived through a selective use of nonlegal materials.

Particularly apt for discussion in the city of Hartford and of special interest to me as an insurance man are the problems of legal liability and insurance.

The basic device used in the production of atomic energy—a nuclear reactor—is potentially a dangerous instrument. The major hazard involved is not heat or blast, as commonly assumed, but radiation emanating from the highly radioactive fission products accumulated within the reactor as waste during periods of operation. These fission products are more toxic than any substance heretofore known, and more insidious. They can neither be seen nor felt. Exposure beyond tolerable limits may bring no sensual reaction, and it could be some time before the effects of exposure become apparent.

A major reactor accident could result in the release of large quantities of these fission products into the atmosphere, contaminating a wide geographic area.

Widely publicized statements describing the theoretical effects of a major reactor incident in graphic terms have contributed greatly to the fears and doubts of the public and of potential members of the atomic energy industry. It must be carefully noted that these statements are designed primarily to plead the cause of care and caution in atomic energy activities. Proper perspective must be given to the theoretical data presented and the conclusions reached. At the present time it seems reasonably certain that inherently safe reactors can be designed and

constructed. Engineering data assures the essential integrity of containment, or the placing of reactors in protective, gas-tight envelopes. Constant and extensive research in reactor safety and radiation protection has provided a basis for increased understanding of the problems involved and for the development of standards and health-safety regulations. The published operating history of 25 reactors in the United States over a period in excess of 12 years shows no accidents involving radiation injury sufficiently serious to cause lost time of personnel during 606,686 operating hours and 17,799,000 man-hours.

Nevertheless, in spite of this remarkable safety record, the catastrophic incident remains a possibility. Regardless of design, location, or isolation, there is no such thing as an absolutely safe nuclear reactor—just as there is no such thing as an absolutely safe chemical plant or ore refinery. There is always present a finite possibility of the occurrence of an event, or series of events, the result of which would be the release of unsafe quantities of radioactive material to the surrounding area. What is frightening about this possibility, however remote it may be, is that the potential damage—the maximum conceivable damage—which can be caused by such an accident is far greater than that which can result from other industrial accidents.

Questions of legal liability and insurance thus are of immediate and significant interest to the growing atomic energy industry and its lawyers. The latter also foresee that it is inevitable that nuclear accidents will give rise to unique legal problems involving statutes of limitation, workmen's compensation procedures, techniques of proof and the introduction of evidence, the conflict of laws, Federal-State relations, and other conceivable technical questions.

The rules of legal liability are a matter of concern not only to the future owner and operator of a reactor but also to the manufacturer and supplier of component parts and to the architect-engineer who may be responsible for the design of a reactor and the supervision of its construction.

The owner and operator is faced with the possibility of being held liable for damages caused by a reactor accident without regard to the question of negligence because of the alleged ultrahazardous activity involved. The manufacturer of reactor parts and equipment, cognizant of Justice Cardozo's famous opinion in *MacPherson v. Buick Co.*, and faced with a likely application of the doctrine of strict liability, must assess his potential liability in terms of every project for which he has manufactured and supplied parts and equipment. Under recent cases, the same appears true of the architect or design engineer.

The only way in which all segments of the industry can protect themselves, in the absence of prohibitive indemnity clauses in commercial contracts, is through insurance. The availability of such insurance in adequate amounts remains a major problem in the effort to develop a private atomic energy industry, and is held by many to be a serious deterrent to large-scale nuclear enterprises.

Under the 1946 act, the atomic-energy program was financed almost wholly from public funds. Accordingly, the Government assumed directly all risk of loss under its general policy of self-insurance on Government property and through indemnity provisions in contracts covering third-party liability. As a result, the private insurers of the country had only a limited knowledge of the hazards involved in atomic-energy activities, no real basis upon which to evaluate those hazards, and no need to develop and make available private coverage in the field.

It is a great credit to the insurance industry that it has recognized a public responsibility in the premises and has indicated, in



the short time that has been available, its readiness to provide liability insurance covering nuclear activities in unprecedented amounts. I have no hesitation in saying that the work of the insurance study group has been one of the most encouraging indications of the willingness of private enterprise to be self-sufficient in atomic-energy affairs.

However, in spite of the \$65 million, third-party-liability coverage which the private insurers have indicated they will offer, the atomic-energy industry—almost unanimously—has indicated a reluctance to proceed without assurance that they will be financially protected to the full extent of their potential liability. This may be beyond the combined capacity of the insurance industry. This poses a very serious problem. The unwillingness of the industry to get on with the job without open-ended coverage is a serious and immediate threat to the public interest in the rapid development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and raises a question concerning participation by the Federal Government in the insurance problem and in the reactor program generally.

No one is very happy over the prospect of the Government entering the atomic-energy insurance field. Yet the Government does have a basic responsibility to do everything possible to develop an atomic-energy industry as rapidly as possible and, at the same time, to make certain that in the course of such development a risk of unprecedented loss is not thrust upon the public without adequate provision for relief. It would seem, therefore, that if the reluctance of the atomic-energy industry is well-founded, this Nation may face this alternative: either some form of Government assistance must be provided in the insurance field, or the Congress may decide to proceed with Government-financed reactors under normal-indemnity provisions covering third-party liability in order to keep the program rolling. That problem now faces the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress, and insofar as it is the burden of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we intend to determine our policy as promptly as we can.

Several bills have been introduced in the present session of the Congress in an attempt to meet the problem, and recently the joint committee held an executive seminar to hear the views of both the atomic energy industry and the insurers. This proved to be a very valuable experience, and the committee is considering holding open hearings on the insurance problem in the near future.

I should point out at this point that the recent survey made by a committee of distinguished public citizens, known as the McKinney Panel on the Impact of Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, concluded that the time had not arrived to consider the need for a Federal atomic insurance program covering peaceful uses. Rather, the panel suggested that the efforts of private insurance companies to deal with the problem should be encouraged, and expressed the opinion that at least 2 and possibly 3 years remain in which to conduct research and accumulate knowledge and experience before any substantial private activity would be delayed or stopped because of the inability to obtain adequate insurance. The panel concluded that a Federal atomic insurance program constituted a threat to private atomic enterprise, not a benefit. It is, the report states, "a last resort not yet called for and one which may not be needed." I would hope that the forthcoming hearings will thoroughly explore the entire field of insurance and test the soundness of the panel's conclusions.

In addition to questions of liability and insurance, the nature of the hazards connected with atomic energy work suggest the possibility of other legal problems.

Consider the question of the statutes of limitation which require the commencement

of an action for damages within a prescribed number of years after the cause of action occurs. In most jurisdictions, the period of limitation begins to run from the date of the alleged wrong—in the case of radiation injury, from the date of exposure. But, as I have pointed out, the insidious nature of radiation is such that the fact of overexposure and its effects may not be manifest for many years. By that time, the statutory period may have expired and the cause of action barred. This seems to me a legal problem which will require careful thought in the interest of preserving the rightful claims of the general public. Some modification of the statutes is indicated in order to extend the period of limitations in actions for damages caused by radiation, or to recognize that actions involving radiation injuries present a special case of public policy which outweighs the general desirability of requiring that lawsuits be brought to trial with a minimum of delay.

Similar problems are presented in the field of workmen's compensation in connection with the general requirement that notice of a compensable injury be given the employer within a short time after its occurrence and that claims for compensation be made within a limited period after the injury or disability becomes apparent. It seems certain that a reconsideration of local workmen's compensation laws by State legislatures will be necessary unless the atomic energy worker is to be severely penalized. Indeed, many of the legislatures and industrial commissions now have the problem under consideration.

I have previously referred to the wide geographic area which quite possibly could be affected in the event of a major nuclear accident. This may include at least two adjacent States. In such case, there will be a problem in what lawyers call the conflict of laws: What law will govern in the event of a so-called "interstate tort"—the law of the State where the radioactivity was released or the jurisdiction where the exposure took place? It is obvious that legal imagination and boldness will be required in solving unusual questions such as this.

Let me give you a few legal brain twisters:

1. How do you prove or disprove negligence in the atomic-energy industry if the operations are shrouded in secrecy?
2. If radiation damage appears, how do you prove which of several possible radiations caused the damage?
3. If radiation damage appears after a long period of time and you can prove where the damage came from, how do you collect if the organization responsible is not longer in business?
4. If radiation causes damage to the genes in a parent, to whom does the right of action belong—the parent or the deformed child?
5. If it takes an Einstein to understand the theory of relativity, how can a jury decide whether a reactor is run negligently or carefully.

In this brief time, I have tried to outline for you what I believe to be some of the legal problems which will exist in the transition period of the atomic age. That some of the problems will be unusual or unique is apparent, and their solution will require legal pioneering of a high order. This, however, is a common experience attending the growth of any new industry, particularly when it widely affects the activities and conduct of the general public and is dependent upon continuing technological advance. In addition to the unusual problems, there will be the everyday, run-of-the-mill questions of adaptation to these circumstances. This will require high standards of craftsmanship. The history of the legal profession has been a dynamic one, and I am confident that the lawyers of the Nation are capable of meeting any challenge which may be presented by this new scientific and industrial force—the energy of the atom.

## Fresno County, Calif., Celebrates Its Centennial and 100 Years of Progress

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. B. F. SISK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise on the floor of this House today as the Representative whose district includes Fresno County, Calif., to call the attention of the Members to a most significant event in the history of that county.

Tomorrow will mark the 100th anniversary of the enactment on April 19, 1856 by the Legislature of the State of California of an act creating Fresno County. All this week the people of the county are celebrating this event and are pausing to pay tribute to the pioneers whose vision and courage, hard work and sacrifice, have contributed to the county's foremost position in our country. I am most happy to add my word to theirs and to ask that the Members join with me in marking this hundredth anniversary and recognizing its importance to the San Joaquin Valley, the State of California, and the Nation.

The people of Fresno County are rightly proud that their industry, vision, and hard work have carved an agricultural empire out of semi-desert and have won for the county for at least the past seven years an official classification as the richest county of the Nation in value of agricultural production.

Land that once was arid and non-productive today nurtures the roots of farm crops valued at more than \$300 million annually and forms the foundation for the steel and concrete and homes of 15 thriving, growing cities. The bounty of this 5,985 square miles of area comes from its fertile farm lands, its beautiful and valuable forests and its mineral-producing formations.

The key that opened the door to this phenomenal growth was water—water in the hands of farmers willing to couple their toil with a farsighted realization of the possibilities for making Fresno County a modern Garden of Eden.

From a sparsely cultivated, dry farming economy, with limited cattle and sheep raising, these farmers have successfully progressed through one-crop dependency on grapes and raisins to today's versatile production of some 86 different species of field, horticultural and seed crops. The 1954 total crop value represents an increase of almost 10 times the value of crops raised in the county in 1935, while acreage planted has increased from 450,000 to 1,329,210 in 1954.

In addition to its agricultural production, Fresno County is noted for its beautiful forests which provide both valuable timber and recreation for thousands of people, including visitors from all parts of the world who enjoy with us the scenic grandeur of the Sierra Nevada and its great national parks.

Concentrated in the county's western area is some \$116 million in annual pro-

duction of minerals such as natural gas, petroleum, and quicksilver, while the mountains to the east are mined for tungsten, gold, silver, and other minerals.

Its great attraction of climate and location have resulted in a constantly increasing industrial growth for Fresno County. Twenty years ago there were only 4,000 manufacturing employees in the county, while in 1954, 14,600 workers in industrial plants earned more than \$94 million.

Fresno City, seat of the county, is the trading center and metropolis for the entire central section of the San Joaquin Valley, and is growing by leaps and bounds. A recent census disclosed more than 200,000 persons in this metropolitan area.

From its small beginnings as a sleepy frontier community a hundred years ago, Fresno County has achieved miracles of development and it can confidently look forward to equal miracles of progress in the future, which I know all of us want to see directed toward greater happiness, stability and finer achievements for all of the people of this great county. Tomorrow I am flying out to join with the people of my county in their centennial celebration and from the expressions of many of the Members here, I know that I can take with me the congratulations and best wishes of this House to the people of Fresno County.

### Civil-Rights Legislation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EARL CHUDOFF**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, a program of civil-rights legislation can and must be enacted in this session of Congress.

There is nothing before this Congress more vital to our national conscience and to our international self-respect than assuring all citizens of this great Nation freedom and security in the exercise of their constitutional civil and human rights.

We all know that the suppression of and infringement on those rights is still a threat. We cannot expect to continue to lead a strong free world successfully as long as our enemies can exploit this as a defect in our national character.

Our forefathers had the courage to recognize and declare the equality of men before God and the law. Can we do less than enforce this equality?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot, we must not, let down the people of the world now. We must not fail to do what we know is right, just, and necessary. We must wipe out every vestige of the suppression of the civil rights of millions of our fellow countrymen.

On April 9 the Attorney General sent to the Congress a so-called civil-rights program of the present administration. Unfortunately, this is a weak and inadequate program. Evidently strong lead-

ership in this vital field does not grow on the golfing greens of Georgia.

The administration's program does not go nearly as far toward the protection of civil rights as do bills introduced by myself and by other Members of Congress. I am sure the administration's program does not go as far as Congress is ready to go right now.

Mr. Speaker, the great interests of the Nation and of the free world require that we in Congress take the lead and enact a good civil-rights program immediately. We must put an end to lynching; we must strengthen our election laws and abolish the poll tax; we must guarantee to all citizens full protection and enforcement of each and every constitutional right; we must wipe out discrimination in interstate travel. A vigorous commission with authority to study all types of economic, social, legal, and other developments affecting civil rights and with a duty to present its findings to the President, to Congress, and to the country must be established. A regular joint committee of Congress should be set up with the protection of civil rights as its main concern. The civil-rights activities of the Justice Department must be strengthened and made effective.

These measures will be a definite step in the right direction. They will do much to redeem our national conscience and to restore our place in the minds and hearts of oppressed and hopeful people everywhere.

### The Farm Bill

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week we debated one of the most important legislative proposals to come before the House in this session of Congress. The omnibus farm bill which was presented at that time was a genuine disappointment to me in view of the urgency with which I regard the problems of American agriculture today. It was my hope that the conference committee would present to the House a bill embodying the far-reaching and constructive recommendations which the President and his administration formulated in a sincere effort to assist the American farmer. My strongest disappointment sprang from the insistence that rigid price supports be reinstated on basic crops even for the 1-year period provided in the bill.

The appalling consequences of the rigid price support plan are felt by every farmer in the Nation today who is experiencing lower prices for his commodities because of the fantastic surpluses which have been created through 10 years of rigid price supports. I have opposed the further extension of rigid price supports in the past and my opposition has not diminished. I believe that any thinking individual who is sin-

cere in his concern for American farm prices must conclude that we must abolish these surpluses and with them the rigid price support program which has fostered and stimulated them.

It is my belief that American agriculture must continue to be based upon the production of the small family farmer. While rigid price supports have offered only inconsequential direct benefits to this type of farm operation, the program has greatly benefited the large commercial type farm. This has stimulated these large commercial operators to grow more and more of the crops already in surplus. The result has been the piling up of more surpluses which have, in turn, depressed market prices and created a serious economic hardship for the small farmer in southeastern Ohio and throughout this country.

Last week when this bill came to a vote in the House, I hoped that it could be returned to the conference committee to remove the objectionable and somewhat contradictory provisions it contained. I favored the motion to recommit the bill for the purpose of removing those provisions. That motion failed. Returning to the conference report, I recognized the value of placing the soil bank proposal in operation this year so that American farmers could have its benefits without delay.

The bill also contained a provision whereby farmers might exercise greater freedom from acreage restrictions with respect to wheat grown and used on their farms. This provision is of particular importance to hundreds of small farmers in my congressional district who have experienced difficulty under past restrictions.

My bill, H. R. 4570, would allow farmers freedom from such controls and, although a similar measure has been passed by the Senate, there seems little or no likelihood that the House Committee on Agriculture will take affirmative action this year on my proposal and similar bills introduced by a number of my colleagues.

With these provisions in mind, I reluctantly supported the conference report when it was brought to a vote on the floor of the House a week ago. Admittedly, it was a difficult decision. The balance seemed nearly even.

Assuredly, it was a difficult decision for President Eisenhower when the bill came to his desk for study. He weighed those same factors in the balance and, based upon his information, the bad outweighed the good. Furthermore, he has shown a determination to fight this thing through. He has indicated that the forces of his administration will be employed in wresting a workable farm bill from a reluctant Democrat majority in the Congress.

The President's veto of this bill and his reasons for the action he has taken are, in my opinion, cogent and sound. They are based upon a concern for the problems of the American farmer which transcends any immediate partisan gain which his approval of the bill might have obtained. I support his action.

In his veto message, the President has urged the Congress to enact legislation authorizing the establishment of the soil



bank proposal. In this I heartily concur and wish to express my conviction that the Congress, if it is motivated by an honest concern for the American farmer, will act quickly on this measure. There are no acceptable reasons, in my opinion, why this cannot be done and done now without any more verbiage. Political intransigence will be understood by our people when they evaluate any failure of the Congress to enact the soil bank legislation. Election year politics is no substitute for positive and constructive action by the Congress this year.

I recognize that the soil bank proposal may not, in itself, bring great direct benefits to many small farmers. Its benefits, however, will be appreciable and real when we consider that this program will reduce the surpluses and cause a general rise in the price of farm commodities. The decline in farm income is our problem today. Since the soil bank proposal will contribute to the solution of this problem, its benefits will be felt by all farmers in the prices they receive for basic crops. We must meet this challenge by formulating our solutions directly and honestly.

I wish to urge that the Congress enact a soil bank proposal bill immediately.

**Watsonville (Calif.) Register-Pajaronian Wins Sigma Delta Chi Public Service Award**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Sigma Delta Chi Professional Journalistic Fraternity yesterday announced that its 1956 award for public service in journalism would go to the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian which is published in Watsonville in the 10th Congressional District of California.

Only twice before in the history of the award has this honor, one of the very highest in American journalism, been bestowed upon a newspaper not published in a metropolitan city. Never before has it been awarded to a newspaper in the West. Neither has it ever been given to a more deserving recipient.

Under the leadership of its editor, Mr. Frank Fletcher Orr, the Register-Pajaronian has long been the conscience of its community. A rare combination of aggressive and meticulous reporting, imaginative editing, and judicious editorial comment have made this newspaper an outstanding example of sound, constructive American journalism with a reputation which far exceeds its immediate circulation area. I know that the community of Watsonville daily enjoys the expressed respect and admiration of great metropolitan newspapers of much larger circulation.

Mr. Speaker, the community of Watsonville is no different from hundreds of cities of comparable size throughout the

length and breadth of the United States. Its newspaper, the Register-Pajaronian, faces similar problems with similar resources as do scores of newspapers of comparable circulation from coast to coast. What makes it outstanding, and what now has won for it the coveted honor of the Sigma Delta Chi award, is the intelligent approach, the refusal to compromise with truth, the fearless determination to learn and report all the facts, and let the chips fall where they may.

This week, when the American Society of Newspaper Editors will hold its meeting here in Washington, much will be said about Freedom of the Press. We all know that there are many forces working consciously or inadvertently to restrict this freedom. May I suggest that in the United States of America, freedom of the press will never be in danger so long as courageous, intelligent editors with capable staffs are doing their jobs the way Frank F. Orr and the staff of the Register-Pajaronian have been and are doing theirs in Watsonville, Calif.

The late great William Allen White proved to all America with his Emporia (Kans.) Gazette that a small-town newspaper can, through sheer enterprise and excellence, gain influence far beyond the confines of its own small circulation area. As the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of California, I am intensely proud that the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian is gaining national recognition for taking the same approach.

**The Need for the Housing Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an effort in progress to make political capital of the fact that a group of women will gather in Washington next week to exercise the important force of public opinion about consumer preferences in homes.

Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, recently asked the women of the United States to tell him what type of home they as homemakers would like to live in. From some 3,000 replies, he chose about 100 that seemed to show the keenest interest, the most insight into this problem and the most fruitful ideas. With some regard to geographical location, 100 women were invited to attend the Housing Conference that will meet in the Nation's Capital on April 23, 24, and 25.

It is an example of truly representative government that the Housing and Home Finance Agency should draw upon the collective knowledge and wishes of women in the home to help the Agency in its necessary functions. Mr. Cole's Agency has, among other functions, supervision of the Federal Housing Administration. The statutes and regula-

tions governing the FHA require that in the insurance of mortgages in its regular and most often used programs it should consider the economic soundness of the dwelling with relation to the housing market. Homes that do not meet modern standards and tastes are not economically sound. Who can be more helpful than a panel of 100 women who have demonstrated their interest in this matter, and who represent all segments of our diversified Nation?

As a Member of Congress who has sponsored and supported housing legislation in the past several years, I object to those who say it is silly and useless to ask for this very pertinent information from homemakers. I would remind those who question the need for women's opinions that the latest figures available to me show that women hold 40 percent of the titles of America's 30 million homes and that they pay 40 percent of all property taxes. It is generally agreed by those who have made studies of home buying habits of the American people that women are in the main the final arbiters about whether a home should be purchased and—once bought—what should go into it.

It has been contended also that the recent publication of a book entitled "What People Want When They Buy a House," makes this Housing Congress unnecessary. In checking the facts I learn that although this volume was published last year, it was based upon a sample survey made 6 years ago. The Agency tells me that there was no money available to provide for the publication of the book in the time intervening. The book, I am informed, is an excellent study, but reflects none of the modern developments in housing, nor does it give the woman's point of view which is so important to sound home building.

Those who have the greatest stake in adequate homes for America's families are strongly endorsing the aims of this Housing Conference. Supporters include the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders and the American Institute of Architects.

I would like to add my congratulations to Mr. Cole for originating this project that will attempt to improve homes by going to the people most directly concerned: the women of America.

**President Eisenhower's Restatement of His Philosophy**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JOHN W. HESELTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege of listening to President Eisenhower last evening were fortunate.

His summary of the traditions and philosophy of the Republican Party rich-

ly merits the careful reading and most serious consideration of every voter in this country. The millions of Americans who shared in electing him our President in 1952 have the rare opportunity now of guaranteeing his reelection in November. We can all start now with an immediate and continued effort to make his full statement available to every possible friend and neighbor.

In my opinion, certain portions of that statement are of such striking importance and in such marked contrast to a great deal we all are reading and hearing from certain sources that I want to take this means of making these excerpts available now to as many of my friends and constituents as I can.

The President said:

The mission of our party is to help 167 million Americans build a Nation stronger spiritually and materially, a Nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hope, where effort is rewarded and prosperity shared, where freedom expands and peace is secured.

The President also said:

As a Republican I share my party's deep-lying trust in what free men can do—a fundamental trust in the nature and capability of individual human beings.

People are made in the image of God—

He stated.

They are divinely endowed with aspirations and talents. Their destiny reflects their divine origin. Therefore, the Republican Party must be inspired by a concern that comprehends every American; that sets up no walls of birth or creed or party; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will equal in their dignity.

Speaking of the difference between the Republican and the Democrat Parties, President Eisenhower said:

We are all Americans, but in the practical pursuit of national objectives we differ in our methods, in our traditions, in our philosophy of Government's responsibilities.

I believe the Republican Party, in its methods and traditions and broad philosophy:

1. Offers the best hope of preserving the self-reliance and vigorous independence of individual Americans.
2. Best serves the Nation in the search for peace with justice and freedom.
3. Best fosters a competitive enterprise economy whose purpose is a wider prosperity fairly shared.
4. Best keeps economic decision-making in the hands of the people and out of the hands of government.
5. Best answers the concerns of people for the meeting of their human needs.
6. Best assures our children, and their children's children the heritage of an America rich in all the resources of nature, dynamic in great traditions and ideals and purposes.

The President referred to the record established by this Republican administration and suggested that the Republican Party platform for 1956 should include the following basic principles:

1. The individual is of supreme importance \* \* \* people everywhere—every American of every race and creed should enjoy equally the rights and privileges of free citizens in a free nation.
2. The spirit of our people is the strength of our Nation. The ultimate values of mankind are spiritual. These values include liberty, human dignity, opportunity, and equal rights and justice. These are our heritage and our birthright.

3. America does not prosper unless all Americans prosper. More jobs and better jobs, and happier living for every family \* \* \* call for a strong, growing, private-enterprise economy.

4. Government must have a heart as well as a head \* \* \* Government should increase and strengthen personal and family security without impairing the self-respect, initiative, and incentive of the individual.

5. Courage in principle, cooperation in practice make freedom positive \* \* \* all parts of our American community deserve the concern and support of Government in making their contribution to our well-being.

6. The purpose of Government is to serve, never to dominate.

He quoted Abraham Lincoln, "In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

7. To stay free, we must stay strong. We must gird ourselves with sufficient military strength to discourage resort to war and protect our Nation's vital interests; we must help to strengthen the collective defense of free nations against those who would seek their ends through aggression. Our own and our allied strength must be spiritual, intellectual, scientific, material.

8. Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples. The peace we want will be the product of understanding and agreement and law among Nations \* \* \*. It will foster the concentration of human energy for the advancement of human standards in all the areas of mankind's material, intellectual, and spiritual life.

## Opposition to H. R. 7089

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, out of the 435 complement of the House of Representatives, 6 Members were appointed during the 83d and 84th Congresses to a special group known as the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. Under a special rule of the House which permitted no amendments except by the special committee, a significant piece of legislation, H. R. 7089, was introduced last year and passed the House of Representatives on July 13, 1955.

I concede the fact that some of the bill's provisions were good, however, the bad features far outweighed any merits. I, therefore, take this opportunity to indicate my reason for voting against this bill, because in all good conscience, I could not agree with the concept of basing death compensation on the attained rank and length of service of an individual as proposed in section 202 (a). This section contained one of the most radical changes in existing legislation and, in my opinion, has never been made in the history of our country.

I am convinced that a life given for one's country is a life, whether the individual be a general or a private. There is certainly a need to provide for the widow and children in either case, yet who is to say that a widow and children of a general should have more benefits than the

widow and children of a private. Let us compare the pay of each. A general receives approximately \$1,200 a month as opposed to \$120 a month for a private. These figures alone immediately indicate that the chances of leaving a sizable estate are much better in the higher than in the lower ranks.

I do not object to increasing benefits to widows and children of men who make the supreme sacrifice, however, I strenuously object to any system that would create a wide disparity between benefits given families of high-ranking officers and next-of-kin of privates, airmen, and seamen.

The high military echelon voiced their approval of this bill, and well they should. This is an excellent proposal for the career military personnel, who in view of long service have a better opportunity to attain some degree in rank. But what of the civilian soldier called to serve his country for the duration of an emergency? The majority have little opportunity to rise above the E-3 to E-5 bracket where the great number of deaths occur. These individuals have been forced to leave their families, their homes and their jobs—in most instances, jobs which pay far more than the military.

For example, let us consider the case of a lieutenant colonel with a monthly income of approximately \$525 and the newly inducted private, just out of basic training, who prior to induction was earning \$125 a week either as a steelworker, glassworker, or coal miner. The wives of both men enjoyed similar standards of living prior to the private's entry into service. Both men lose their lives, side by side, by the same enemy shell. The private's widow receives as her death compensation \$122, while the wife of the lieutenant colonel would receive between \$169 and \$193, depending upon the length of service. I can see no equity in such a proposal—both faced the same hazards, both subjected themselves to the same dangers—yet the widow of one receives far greater benefits than the other.

The Federal Government has a direct obligation to the widows of men killed in service of their country. However, this obligation should be discharged in the historic manner of equality and not based on rank and length of service. I have long advocated an increase in compensation based on a flat sum. In lieu of the formula contained in section 202 (a) of H. R. 7089, I suggested a flat monthly rate of compensation to all widows in the amount of \$140, since this appeared to me to be equitable in view of the loss of the servicemen's indemnity.

Other provisions of the bill calls for expansion of social-security benefits—depending on rank and longevity of the deceased serviceman—and a lump-sum gratuity of between \$800 to \$3,000—again depending on the deceased husband's rank and longevity. I could not look upon these features in favor and I voted against its final passage and endeavored to persuade by colleagues to do likewise. Even though the bill passed the House of Representatives over negative objections by many conscientious Members of Congress, I have been



gravely concerned over its future, because of the injustice involved and the resulting effects upon the morale of a great majority of the men in service during an emergency.

I cannot endorse any proposal injecting the philosophy that rank, length of service or military pay should be considered as factors in discharging the Federal Government's obligation to the widows and children of our servicemen who died as a result of service connected disabilities.

H. R. 7089 is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope the committee will strike this rank philosophy from the bill.

### Federal Employees Need and Deserve Basic Guaranties Provided in Union Recognition and Arbitration Bill

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GEORGE M. RHODES**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to H. R. 10237, a bill to provide for the recognition of Federal employee unions and the establishment of arbitration machinery for the settlement of grievances. I am pleased to note that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has scheduled hearings next month on an identical bill, S. 3593, introduced by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON. Because of the demonstrated need for this type of legislation, I am hopeful that hearings may also be scheduled by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following guest article on this subject, which appeared in the April 13, 1956, issue of the Government Standard, the newspaper of the American Federation of Government Employees:

ON CAPITOL HILL

(By GEORGE M. RHODES)

Employees of the Federal Government enjoy the unique distinction of having 166 million employers, since it is their duty to provide a necessary assortment of scientific, technical, clerical, and administrative services to all our citizens.

As our Government has grown, both in complexity and the scope of its activities, it has become clear that those Americans who serve their fellow citizens, need and have a right to expect basic guaranties affecting their conditions of employment. Tens of millions of employees in private industry have long since been granted certain well-defined rights in the field of labor-management relations. The labor-management-relations law, established by act of Congress, makes this significant statement in its findings and declaration of policy:

"Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging prac-

tices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees."

But unfortunately, our Government has not chosen to legally apply a similar set of rules to dealings with its own employees. A beginning was made in 1912 with the passage of the Lloyd-La Follette Act, which guaranteed Federal employees the right to join unions of their choice—provided such unions did not impose an obligation to strike against the Government. However, there was no requirement that the executive branch of the Government recognize or deal with such unions as the spokesmen for Federal employees.

Thus, effective labor-management relations having any degree of bargaining rights binding upon executive branch "employees," are nonexistent in the Federal service. The injustices of this situation have long been recognized by many responsible authorities.

The 1955 report of the American Bar Association's Committee on Labor Relations of Governmental Employees said:

"A government which imposes upon other employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar favorable basis, modified, of course, to meet the exigencies of the public service. It should set the example for industry by being perhaps more considerate than the law requires of private enterprise."

It is obvious that some practical machinery for dealing adequately and fairly with the labor-management problems arising between the Federal Government and its employees is badly needed. I have introduced such remedial legislation in the past several Congresses.

Recently I introduced H. R. 10237, a strengthened version of my previous bill, H. R. 697. The chief difference is that the new bill provides for arbitration of disputes as a final recourse. It would give Government employee unions official recognition in the Government and require executive agencies and departments to deal with them on personnel policy matters and employee grievances.

A similar bill, though without the arbitration feature, was favorably reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1952 by a vote of 14 to 1. Unfortunately, the action came too late in the session for floor debate to be scheduled. It was placed on the Consent Calendar but chances for enactment were killed by the objection of a single Member.

In the past, established unions representing Government employees have discussed personnel problems and presented grievances to various administrative officers of the Government; but this action is a matter of suzerainty rather than a right. If the Government administrator or his subordinates should refuse to meet or discuss the problem with union representatives, or should fail to take the necessary remedial action, the aggrieved parties have no appeal short of Congress.

As the American Bar Association pointed out in its report:

"Government which denies to its employees the right to strike against the people, no matter how just might be the grievances, owes to its public servants an obligation to provide working conditions and standards of management-employee relationships which would make unnecessary and unwarranted any need for such employees to resort to stoppage of public business. . . ."

I regret that no action on my bills has been forthcoming in the present Congress, despite the clearly demonstrated need for some type of remedial legislation to provide basic rights for Federal employees. Not one of the ex-

ecutive agencies or Departments of the present administration has even submitted a report to the committee stating their views on the proposed legislation—in favor or in opposition. They have chosen to ignore the existence of the bills, which is to deny that any problem or need exists. This "head in the sand" policy of the administration is shortsighted and unfair to the millions of loyal and devoted public servants who are entitled to workable standards of conduct affecting their hours and conditions of employment, vacations, and sick leave, as well as the expeditious settling of grievances which necessarily arise.

This present administration policy is also unfair to the citizens of our Nation because the present adherence to outmoded employee-management practices is contrary to sound and enlightened public personnel administration. It is arbitrary, unjust, and undemocratic. It destroys the morale of efficient and hard-working Government employees through the pyramiding of resentment, misunderstandings, and irritation because of the failure to provide necessary grievance machinery and other sound principles of employee-management relations which have been in effect in private industry for many years.

I feel that the principles and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and just. I feel that the need for enactment of such legislation is urgent. It is the duty of both the administration and the Congress to recognize this need and act accordingly, without further delay.

### "For Where Your Treasure Is, There Will Your Heart Be Also"

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who would disregard the old just because it is old are reminded that the thought expressed in the above quotation from the Sermon on the Mount is still with us.

That pressure groups are still thinking in terms of temporary, material self-interest, rather than the permanent welfare of all, is demonstrated every time Congress is called upon to enact major legislation carrying appropriations.

Every thinking individual knows that paying a Government subsidy which increases a price for the production of anything, whether it be automobiles or farm products, above that fixed by supply and demand, will result in the creation of a surplus.

Because of farm subsidies which came to us with the war and which were then necessary, we now have on hand billions of dollars worth of agricultural products, the mere possession of which is costing us a million dollars a day. The fair, useful disposal of that surplus appears to be an unsolvable problem. We know that a continuation of the payment of subsidies will but increase our dilemma. The approximate overall cost value, as of April 4, 1956, of surplus commodities in storage was \$5,165,395,000.

What I am trying to express is the idea that some of those who insist upon

the continuation of a high, rigid farm subsidy, who object to the President's veto of the farm bill, have a personal financial interest in that type of legislation.

Justifiably, they say that, having been enticed by the Government into overproduction, and having assumed obligations which they otherwise would not have incurred, supports should not be suddenly, wholly kicked out from under them. With that I can agree.

While a continuation of subsidies at a high level will but make our farm problem worse, the shock of a total, sudden withdrawal of benefit payments should be tempered by a gradual but ever-continuing lessening of such payments.

#### CHASING THE DOLLAR

But in seeking and applying the remedy, we should not forget that some of those who insist upon a rigid 90 percent of parity policy are personally financially interested. The Farmers' Union, ostensibly in behalf of the little fellow, has been putting the heat on Congressmen, but has not publicized the fact that some of its members are financially interested in and control the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association. That outfit, during the year ending December 22, 1955, in the Minneapolis area alone, collected fees for storing surplus wheat, corn, barley, oats, rye, flax, and soybeans, amounting to the not insignificant sum of \$1,604,069.

The Farmers' Union has the right to establish for financial gain storage facilities. But when they write me stressing the need of the small farmer and his family, who profit but little if any from subsidy payments, I wish they would also advise whether the big boys of the Farmers' Union who are in the storage business are sharing their storage profits with the small farmer. How many small farmers have received a dividend check from the storage organizations of the Farmers' Union?

Why not, instead of laying up treasure for a few, enact legislation for the long-time, overall welfare of all the people?

### We Must Protect American Labor and Industry From Unfair Foreign Competition

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the OTC legislation, represented by H. R. 5550 and reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means, strikes me as extremely important. H. R. 5550 is not just another bill. It is one of those crucial proposals that would change radically the lines of our constitutional division of powers.

The State Department seeks through this legislation to obtain the consent of Congress to its own abject demotion to

the sidelines in the matter of regulating foreign commerce. If this seems presumptuous it is in keeping with that Department's action in this field during the past 10 years. By one scheme or another it has aimed at obtaining and keeping control over our tariff and related aspects of trade. H. R. 5550, the OTC proposal, is only the last in a series of steps.

Why does this interest me as a Member of Congress?

It interests and concerns me for several reasons. In the first place, as a Member of Congress, I am bound to carry out my obligations and responsibilities as a Congressman; and this clearly does not involve resignation to the State Department or the abdication of powers that the Constitution has placed upon us, whether on the grounds of expediency, following the path of least resistance, or anything else.

Second, I have definite obligations to the people who elected me. It has become something of a stigma to acknowledge this fact. We hear of bowing to "local selfish interests" when we pay attention to the electorate back home.

In this particular instance I am speaking for such local selfish interests as the owners of and workers in various industries in my district. They have a real stake in this legislation. Their interests, that is, their economic welfare, the wage levels, the employment opportunities and the very value of investments in plants, mills, and manufacturing enterprises in my district are affected by and stand to benefit or lose by what Congress does or does not do in its action on this bill. We are not legislating in a vacuum.

If the employment opportunities of men and women in the manufacture of watches and clocks is a local, selfish concern then I am guilty of catering to local selfish interests in seeking to preserve and to promote such employment. If continuity or increase of employment at good wages in rubber-soled-footwear plants, or in factories producing bicycles and parts, or in those making wood screws and metal fasteners or in textile plants in my district is a matter of local selfish interest, then again I am guilty of upholding such narrow interests; and I may say that I am proud to do it.

At the same time I will challenge anyone to say that it is against the national interest for a Member of Congress to speak for those who elected him, to seek to preserve their jobs and their earnings against influences that might upset them or even take them away.

For these several reasons I support the resolution introduced on both sides of the aisle, by the gentleman from Maine and by the gentleman from West Virginia. The OTC bill leaves too much in the dark. It presents us with a handle to a pan but says nothing of what is to be cooked in the pan, or how. We are simply to agree to hand over the pan to cooks in Geneva, Switzerland, who will want to use it as they see fit, to cook what they please.

Looking back over the last 10 or 20 years of State Department activity, I am convinced that American industry, American producers, including some important parts of our agriculture, would be asked to supply the goose to be cooked,

and if the past is any guide to the future that goose would be cooked in short order. I am afraid that Congress' own goose would be cooked at the same time. We are here, among many other things, to regulate foreign commerce. Evidently that means what it says.

I am not willing to give the pan and its handle away; and I do not believe that any reservations about the use of the pan will do us much good so long as we leave it to others to decide what is to be cooked in it.

To be plain about it, amendments to the OTC, such as those adopted by the Ways and Means Committee, can do little good so long as GATT itself remains free to operate under the power of self-amendment without reference to Congress.

In H. R. 5550 we are addressing ourselves only to the OTC, that is, to the pan and its handle. What goes into the pan and how it is to be cooked; that is, the real substance of the issue, corresponds to GATT and GATT is not brought before us in H. R. 5550. GATT would be left free to work out its own destiny beyond the reach of Congress. It could by a two-thirds vote extend its own powers without consultation of Congress in any way. GATT has amended itself in the past; and there is nothing in H. R. 5550 or in the OTC agreement or in the amendments adopted by the Ways and Means Committee that would prevent its doing so in the future.

What good could I do then in behalf of the many producers in my district who would be injured by action taken in Geneva? Neither I nor any other Member of Congress would be able to reach the decision-making spot in Geneva, or if we could the delegates from the 35 countries congregated there behind closed doors would be under no obligation either to see us or pay us the least attention.

Is that the goal to which we want to move? Is that the way we want to dispose of our responsibility to regulate the foreign commerce of this country?

There are those who deny that membership in the OTC would have that effect. I say the burden of proof is on them. We have observed for 10 years or more the direction of State Department activities in this field. It has moved ever farther away from congressional control directly toward international control of our foreign trade. The ban on import quotas written into GATT is only one example.

It would require a complete reversal of State Department policy to prevent loss by Congress of its authority to an international organization in this field if Congress should approve OTC membership on behalf of the United States. The burden of proof to the contrary is indeed upon those who deny this.

Let them bring GATT before us for a thorough examination. If they balk at this, they will demonstrate the duplicity of their position. If they have nothing to hide, if they are not bent on wresting powers from Congress and lodging them in Geneva, they will gladly come forward and place before Congress the full record of the State Department in its GATT



negotiations. Then Congress can determine for itself what is what.

In my opinion the resolution should be adopted forthwith.

### Cotton Cannot Go It Alone

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at the annual meeting of the Western Cotton Shippers Association, in El Paso, Tex., on April 12, 1956. This is one of the greatest agricultural speeches which has ever been delivered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### COTTON CANNOT GO IT ALONE

(Address by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

This is a difficult time to be talking about farm problems and particularly about cotton. The Senate took weeks to pass a farm bill. About a year ago the House of Representatives passed a farm bill also. The two bills were far apart. Now the conferees have spent two weeks trying to bring them together into something that will receive Presidential action. You will notice I did not say will receive Presidential approval. I have not been able to determine accurately for myself whether the program was to produce a bill that the President would veto in the hope that some slight political value may result, or whether it was planned to work out a bill that the President could sign.

Today I want to review what the Senate tried to put into its farm bill and what has happened in the cotton picture which seems to make the action taken by the Senate the proper one for the industry as well as for the country.

We had long hearings on the new farm legislation. I commend the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, for traveling across this country trying to find out what the farmers wanted. After I studied the hearings I became convinced that farmers were not unanimous in what they wanted. In one part of the country there seemed to be quite a bit of approval for a program of flexible price supports. In other parts of the country the committee was assured that farmers would settle for nothing less than 90-percent rigid price supports. There was a good deal of testimony indicating that they would take 100 percent if pressed hard enough.

When the hearings were over, our committee tried to write a farm bill. We had before us all the suggestions that had been developed, boiled down to what the committee felt might be considered in a final bill.

When we came to our final votes, my first motion was to strike the price provisions from the bill on the theory that we should be seeking to shrink agricultural production, and that the soil bank which had been proposed by the President to do that, had a chance for early enactment, possibly as early as the middle of February. I thought we could then proceed to fight over the price

question at our leisure. Further there was then in the bill a surplus disposal provision based upon a resolution which I had submitted the first day of the Congress, and I wanted to see it passed.

I have said repeatedly that there are two ways to help the American farmer. The first is to dispose of the burdensome surpluses which hang over the market and depress all agricultural prices—not only for cotton, corn, wheat, and rice, but for livestock as well. Therefore, I felt it necessary to make sure that the Secretary of Agriculture came back to the Congress within 30 days and reported what he was going to do to get rid of these surpluses. That resolution, in my opinion, could have been acted upon by the Senate Agriculture Committee in the first 2 weeks of the new session, and the Secretary would have been before us by the middle of February telling us how he proposed to get rid of surpluses. We could have either taken that medicine or we could have stirred up a new batch, but we could at least have been on our way. Now, 60 days later, we are in the process of trying to pass agricultural legislation which has, to be sure, a surplus disposal provision in it. It still requires the Secretary to report, but gives him 60 days from the date the bill is signed, if it is ever signed. In my opinion, that frees him from any responsibility whatever of coming before the Congress and telling us what he proposes to do.

That was important, because the very first thing that is going to be of interest to the cotton producers and the cotton shippers of this country is whether or not the Secretary intends to dispose of about five million bales of cotton per year in some sort of surplus-disposal program. If he does not, we will continue to accumulate oppressive stocks of cotton. If he does, you will see cotton markets stiffen and cotton prices reflect the result of his program of stepped-up disposal.

The second problem is to bring our expanding agricultural production under control. Let me say to you that we now know enough about the production of cotton so that we have the technology to raise the average yield per acre across the United States on a harvested-acre basis to 700 pounds per acre. Do not cross off that figure too lightly. The average for 1950 and 1951 on a harvested-acre basis was a yield of 269 pounds; 1952 was 379 pounds; 1953 was 324 pounds; and 1955 was 416 pounds. We are on our way and 700 pounds per acre is not an impossible yield. Therefore, if we are to have high cotton production per acre we have to have some device to bring our expanding agriculture production under control. The soil bank, since it was first advocated by Henry Wallace in 1937 and as it was again advocated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson in 1956, is the best single device that can be used to bring about that result.

These then were the two things which I thought needed to be done first. Facing that situation, what did Senator EASTLAND, who was the leader in our cotton legislation this time, seek to do? In the first place, he wanted to see a large export program. He talked with the Secretary of Agriculture steadily and effectively, and the newspapers of February 29 carried a story that the Secretary of Agriculture would put all the Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block effective August 1, and that in return for support of the administration's flexible price-support system he had offered Southern Senators a somewhat higher support price on cotton than they might otherwise have had in view of the large stocks we had on hand.

I was tremendously interested in the story, because I thought it was important to start moving cotton. The Secretary set the export goal as "somewhere in the neighborhood of

5 million bales a year as our share of the world market." That was a very big step in the right direction. We were able to do other things if he could have an export program that moved 5 million bales of cotton.

What were those other things? First of all we put into the bill a provision that we would price cotton on average grades and staples rather than on Middling  $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch. That on the face of it would reduce cotton prices a couple of pennies a pound. We had a long discussion of that in the committee. I took hard work on the part of Senator EASTLAND and me to bring about the adoption of that proposal. We felt that cotton was losing markets at home and abroad and that a reduction of 2 or 3 cents would be desirable. Senator EASTLAND took the position that he would be willing to accept this reduction in price if the Secretary in turn would not reduce the acreage for 1957 and 1958.

I want to comment on that because it is of real importance. If the Secretary used a planted-yield-per-acre basis for the last 5 years, he had the authority, under the law, to reduce cotton acreage to a 1957 allotment of 15,841,000 acres as against the 1956 allotment of 17,400,000 acres. If, however, he used the harvested yield per acre, he would find the average for the last 5 years to be 326 pounds per acre and that would give a 1957 allotment of 14,724,000 acres. I think the Secretary can use either the harvested yield or the planted yield as his yardstick. I think in view of the enormous cotton surplus he would be well advised if he used the harvested-yield basis. Therefore, the cotton economy of this country faced a shrink from 17,400,000 acres to 14,724,000 acres, which was too large.

Furthermore, the Secretary, under the flexible price support program, if he had so desired, could reduce the price level to a figure in the seventies instead of a figure in the eighties. It was indicated by the Secretary that he would be willing to hold the price level at about 86 or 87 percent of parity if Congress would change the provision on grades and staples to average from Middling  $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch and would also be willing to freeze cotton acreage for 1957 and 1958 at 17,400,000 acres.

The effect of that program would have been substantial. It would have said that America was going into the business of regaining a fair share of what historically had been its part of the world export market. That did not mean to go all the way because at one time we had 50 percent of the world's export market—yes, at one time we had 60 percent. Recently we have been down to as low as 20 percent. But 5 million bales would be a reasonable share for the United States to have, and the Secretary could slowly have begun whittling away at the surplus. Meanwhile the price would have dropped a little bit so that cotton would have stayed in competition domestically and worldwide. All of that, I think, would have made a fairly well-rounded program.

However, it didn't work out that way. We were able to get the bill through the Senate with the provisions for average grades and for freezing the acreage still in the bill. But when it went to conference, the conferees took the sweet and rejected the bitter. They kept the provision which would freeze the acreage at 17,400,000 acres, but added to it 90 percent price supports, which means that American cotton will not move domestically as rapidly as it should, will in fact continue to lose its domestic markets to the synthetics, and will not move in world trade without subsidy. It meant, to put it bluntly, that we were going to produce cotton for the Treasury of the United States and sell it to the Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for drafts on Uncle Sam. No greater damage could be done to the cot-

ton farmer of America than to have that sort of philosophy prevail.

Therefore, my message today to you is that cotton can't go it alone. Cotton as it grows in the field in the United States is going to have to have some help from the Congress and from the trade if it does not face extinction. The supply in the United States for the current marketing season, 1955-56, has touched an all-time high of 25.7 million bales, higher than the previous record of 24.6 million bales in 1939-40. During the time that this huge stock was accumulating, cotton has had 90 percent price supports. As a matter of fact, due to the use of Middling  $\frac{7}{8}$ -inch as the grade when the average growth was better than that, cotton has had about 94 or 95 percent price support and has enjoyed a more favorable position than most other crops. The result has been to price cotton out of the market at home and abroad.

The production of synthetic fibers has been increasing with great speed. It is only 15 years ago that 81 percent of the total fiber used in the United States was cotton, and only about 10 percent was rayon and other synthetics. In 1954 it had gone to 69 percent use of cotton and last year to 66 percent. Just how far do the so-called friends of the farmer want it to go? How far are the advocates of 90-percent price supports in the Congress of the United States willing to have rayon and other synthetics take over before we have a realistic approach to the cotton problem?

But we cannot consider only cotton at home. The production of cotton has been increasing all around the world. The only thing that has changed is that the United States has not been able to share in the new markets. Our exports have been gradually decreasing. They averaged 5.3 million bales from 1935 to 1939, but less than 4 million bales from 1950 to 1954, and dropped to 2.4 million bales in 1955. If we want to throw away our world markets, we can. But when we do we jeopardize cotton farming as an industry in the United States.

Cotton can't go it alone. It needs help from Congress, not only in its pricing but in its marketing. The Department of Agriculture, during the latter part of the year 1945 and early 1946, made a very intensive study of the need for research and marketing methods. Material that was accumulated filled a whole wall of filing cabinets in the Department of Agriculture. It took weeks to analyze the uses that were being made of cotton and the possibilities for research in cotton as well as other crops. After that long study, we sent to the Congress a research and marketing bill which was enacted into the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

Just a few days ago, Senator CAPEHART proposed that we spend a hundred million dollars a year for agricultural research and facilities. I called his attention to the fact that the act of 1946 would have authorized \$9½ million in 1947 but nothing was appropriated. It would have authorized \$19 million in 1948 and \$9 million was appropriated. It would have authorized \$48 million in 1950 and \$19 million was appropriated. It would have authorized \$61 million in 1951 and only a tiny fraction of that was appropriated. It would have authorized almost unlimited appropriations in every year since 1951 so that today under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 we could be spending \$100 million on research for agricultural commodities.

We saw in 1946 the problem that has now arisen in 1956. We saw that cotton was going to face competition from synthetics at home and abroad. We were trying hard to provide the necessary basic research so that cotton could find new markets. Instead of that, the cotton producers of this country have been denied their chance for a fair share of trade in this country and in other parts of the world. The great pro-

ducers of synthetics can afford to take from their treasury millions of dollars each year for research. But farmers of this country can't spend it individually and they can't spend it collectively very well.

To be sure, the Supima cotton producers have done a good job in marketing and are on their way to a very creditable demonstration but over the country, generally speaking, no one can sign up the man who has a mule and a few acres of cotton to a fund promotion. Therefore, we have felt that the combined force of the Government might be able to do for all the farmers what a great industrial organization like Du Pont might be able to do for its product. The very fact that these research and marketing appropriations have not been made shows that cotton and other commodities have not had the things to which they were entitled and I say to you that cotton can't go it alone. It needs help fighting through the right kind of research and marketing appropriations in the Bureau of the Budget and in appropriation bills before the Congress of the United States.

And now, some words more directly aimed at the western cotton shippers.

A most important factor in farming is what to do with the harvested products. In your membership, we assuredly have a trade group who are truly valuable in the marketing of harvested cotton. That great commodity of streaming white gold plays an important part in the commodity economy of the great Southwest and West.

I think that the cotton pricing structure of the merchandising system is the most sensitive merchandising operation of any I know. Price reactions or fluctuations occur, by reason of a multitude of variable circumstances. The recorded price changes, occurring by seconds during the market hours of your great cotton futures exchanges, are flashed in a matter of seconds to the four corners of the world—equaling the mechanism of a fine jeweled watch.

Members of your organization offer a complete worldwide marketing service. You buy the produced cotton right at the gin or warehouse and merchandise it out in quantities desired by the spinners worldwide. Your finance system is a marvel—your word is your bond—you make a verbal offer over the telephone for \$10,000, or \$100,000 worth of cotton, and many times no bilateral contract is ever signed, yet the seller never worries that there will be any hitch. Too, you phone the spinner and the same is true. Very few organizations have a record like that. I congratulate you for this.

Foreign consumption of synthetics today is equivalent to 8.9 million bales and domestic consumption is at the annual rate of 4.5 million bales. Those rates have grown rapidly and attention must be given to the vast inroads. The synthetic producers are a most aggressive group of people. The capacity for producing man-made fibers is increasing every year and new mills are scheduled to be built during this year that would permit the expanding of output to the equivalent of another 1 million bales of cotton.

I hope I can give you some good news. I think you as cotton handlers can make plans for a good business this coming season. I look for close to 9½ million bales, or better domestic consumption, and 4 million export, a total of 13½ million versus 11½ million for this current season. You fellows should share in a greater percent of those increases than some of the other areas. Therefore, I would make plans for full steam ahead.

Some apprehension may exist that the present export plans would be unreasonable on the cotton trade in this area, but I would like to believe that you men have enough inventiveness to make up for some of the misgivings of the sales program. Surely the CCC, with its past experience in selling vast

amounts of cotton to the trade, will be fair in its treatment, and not be so restrictive as required in the recent 1-million-bale program. I think that the quality of the cotton favors you manifestly—your area has improved its quality to such a high level that you now have cotton as fine as is grown anywhere, worldwide, and a good product never is at the bottom of the totem pole. You have the finest of qualities; therefore, I have faith your cotton will move to the spinners where you have established its reputation.

Now let us take a closer look at the export situation. The production of cotton in other countries has been climbing steadily since the war, and this year rose to an all-time high of 25.3 million bales—an increase of 7.5 million bales over the 1934-38 level and 12.3 million bales over the 1946 level.

There is no denying that our price policy has been the most important single factor in encouraging this competition. There is no denying either that if the price policies of the past are continued that the United States will be completely out of the cotton-export business in a few years' time. This is not to say that price is the only factor. Some of the foreign countries are following policies of economic nationalism designed to encourage production of both cotton and rayon for self-sufficiency and to provide a means of earning foreign exchange. In such countries price is a secondary consideration, but, fortunately, this situation is not general. It is also true that the shortage of dollars has been, and still is, a factor limiting our exports, but the purchasing power of the rest of the world is improving every year, and the ability to finance imports is less of a factor. Also, the United States is continuing to provide special financing to aid countries in balance of payments difficulties through direct economic aid, sales of local currencies, loans, and the like.

The most important effect of the new export program will be to set a price for cotton that will remove the incentive for expansion of production of both cotton and rayon abroad. Once the fibers are produced we can assume they are going to be sold because other countries simply aren't in a position to hold their stocks off the market for long.

It is necessary that this price be low enough to discourage competing production, if we are to be successful in rebuilding our exports. At the same time the United States cannot afford to engage in price wars to the extent that we break the economies of friendly countries and thus create new economic, political, and even military problems and impair our international security objectives. Our sales will have to be orderly. We must recognize that our surpluses will have to be liquidated over a period of years.

The policy will have to be essentially long range in its nature. Unless some confidence is reestablished in cotton prices the foreign mills may be frightened away from cotton and encouraged to go more and more to the man-made fibers, the prices of which are relatively stable. At the present time the increased use of man-made fibers is coming largely through blending a portion of these fibers with cotton primarily in an effort to reduce the raw material cost. If cotton prices are lowered to a realistic level, and if there is a reasonable assurance that these prices will be fairly stable, I am confident that the use of these blends can be discouraged and that cotton can regain many of these markets. On the other hand, the uncertainty of price and of supply will make this objective very difficult indeed.

While the foreign market is the most important aspect of the cotton marketing problem at the moment, and while it undoubtedly offers a large opportunity for expansion given a reasonable export price policy, we cannot afford to take the domestic market for granted either. Although the



cotton farmers of this country do not have to face the competition from foreign-grown cotton in the domestic market to any significant extent except in the field of extra long staples, the competition from man-made fibers in the domestic market is very real. At the present time the price advantage of rayon over cotton is from 5 to 9 cents per pound in the various end use markets. The quality improvements that have been made and are being made every day in the man-made fibers, tend to increase this competition. The uncertainty of the cotton prices is an additional factor that plays into the hands of our competitors in this market and encourages the mills to use the man-made fibers, prices of which are more stable.

Over the long range the price to which the cotton supports can be lowered must be geared to the cost of production. We must redouble our efforts in research and education to employ all of the resources which modern science can command to find new and improved ways of cultivating, harvesting, and merchandising cotton in order to cut these costs.

If we are successful in our efforts to reduce cost and if we develop a realistic long-range pricing policy, I have no doubt that cotton can and will be able to meet its competition and that our production can continue to expand.

At the same time, we cannot afford to neglect the opportunity for expanding consumption and stimulating the demand for cotton products on the part of the ultimate consumers. There is a real opportunity in this country and throughout the world to increase the use of cotton not only as a percentage of the total textile fibers consumed, but also by increasing the use of textiles by encouraging people to be better dressed and to make their homes more comfortable and more attractive. The programs in research and sales promotion that have been developed in this country have proved their effectiveness. These can and should be expanded. In the rest of the world the opportunity may be even greater. An addition of only 2 pounds of cotton per person per year—the equivalent of 1 pair of overalls or 1 bed sheet—in consumption in the free world would require an addition 6 million bales of cotton and would leave the average person in the free world consuming only one-fourth as much cotton as the average person in the United States. With the rapid increase in the standards of living around the world, the possibility of these objectives is improved. The increase in the population throughout the world is a further factor. I have no doubt that the demand for cotton can be increased, that the production of our farms can be increased, that the income of our cotton farmers and those who handle cotton can be protected and improved if we face the situation and have the courage and the imagination to adopt the policies that are necessary to maintain cotton in a strong competition position from the standpoint of price, quality, and sales effort.

Our Supima producers are setting a fine example of meeting the issues. They are matching the finer world-recognized qualities of the Egyptian cotton through research. They are setting aside \$3 per bale for promotion. They have set their support levels at 75 percent of parity. That is what I call a forthright program designed to meet the situation head on. The Supima people who are our neighbors and friends have the cotton spotlight of the world on them. Washington was dazzled when they came forward not too long ago to sell their program. The spinners over the world, too, have taken special note, and the Egyptians are really watching.

The sales promotion of Supima, too, is moving with vigor. Just think, a small group of producers moving in breeding and developing in a few short years such an out-

standing quality and now producing some 45,000 bales currently, with prospects of some 100,000 bales. Imagine what the results would be, if just half of the Cotton Belt would take on the same amount of vision, fire, and enthusiasm of the Supima growers. Let me tell you, we would be moving 15 million bales annually in a short 3 years. The cotton business would soon be out of the Government's hands and freedom of merchandising would be enjoyed to the fullest extent.

I want to close on that note of hope. God still helps those who help themselves. Cotton farmers, ginners and shippers will be in need of help unless all join to put King Cotton back on a throne by programs of courage and vision in which you may take the lead and in which, I hope, the Congress may give you effective support.

## A Bill To Provide Financing of Needed Housing

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of builders, laborers, lumber and material suppliers, and veterans' groups in my district, I have introduced a bill to provide financing of needed housing.

This bill is similar to one introduced by Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, and referred to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Here is a summary of provisions of the bill:

#### TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Section 101 dealing with FHA title I home improvement loans provides—

- (1) A 2-year extension.
- (2) An increase in the maximum loan amount to \$3,500 (present ceiling is \$2,500) and from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for loans to improve multifamily structures.
- (3) An increase in the maximum loan term to 5 years (present ceiling is 3 years).
- (4) A sliding interest rate scale permitting a 5-percent discount on loans below \$1,000, with a 4-percent discount permitted on that portion of the loan which exceeds \$1,000. Presently a 5-percent discount is charged regardless of loan amount.

Section 102 would permit the FHA to become a self-insurer against fire and hazard risks to properties acquired by FHA as a result of foreclosure.

Section 103 would liberalize rental housing insurance under FHA's section 207 by—

- (1) Permitting a loan up to 90 percent of value (present ceiling is 80 percent of value).
- (2) Increasing loan ceilings to \$2,250 per room (present ceiling is \$2,000) and up to \$2,700 per room for elevator-type structures (present ceiling is \$2,400). In high-cost geographic areas the Commissioner is authorized to increase the per room maximum by an additional \$1,000. These liberalizations would establish loan ceilings for section 207 similar to those permitted for urban renewal insurance projects under section 220.

Section 104 would amend cooperative housing insurance under section 213 by providing—

- (1) A new device to permit a cooperative sponsor to obtain a commitment for a loan

up to 85 percent of replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. This would overcome the marketing difficulties involved in the present requirement that the cooperative be sold 100 percent before construction can begin. The sponsor would certify intent to sell to a cooperative upon completion. Should he fail to sell the project he would be regulated by FHA as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. Also, if the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative, he cannot use this special insurance feature again.

(2) Authority to the FHA Commissioner to permit in the high-cost geographic areas an additional \$1,000 per room in computing the maximum permissible insured loan.

Section 105 would increase the FHA mortgage insurance authorization to make available \$3 billion for the next fiscal year.

Section 106 would permit a profit and risk allowance of 10 percent for sponsors of urban renewal insurance projects under section 220, although the FHA Commissioner could prescribe a lesser percentage if he certifies that a 10-percent allowance is unreasonable.

Section 107 would liberalize relocation housing insurance under section 221 by—

- (1) Increasing the maximum permissible loan to \$8,600 and to \$9,600 in geographic high-cost areas. (Present ceilings are \$7,600 and \$8,600, respectively.)

(2) Permitting no downpayment financing by requiring only that the borrower pay at least \$150 in cash to apply toward closing costs.

(3) Increasing the permissible loan maturity from the present 30 years' ceiling to 35 years and up to 40 years where the Commissioner finds such longer maturity necessary for low-income families.

Section 108 would amend the cost certification requirement by making such certifications incontestable after the Commissioner's approval of the certification, barring fraud or material misrepresentation. It would also permit an allocation of general overhead costs acceptable to the Commissioner to be included in the total certified cost.

#### TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET LEGISLATION

Section 201 would liberalize the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association by—

- (1) Permitting advance commitments under the secondary market operations. Such commitments would be issued at a price high enough to provide production support to builders and yet sufficiently below the prices offered by the Association for immediate purchase to discourage excessive sales to FNMA pursuant to advance commitments.
- (2) Reducing the stock purchase requirement to no more than 2 percent.

(3) Requiring FNMA until June 30, 1957, to pay par for special assistance mortgages.

(4) Increasing the advance commitment funds available for special assistance operations to \$400 million (present ceiling is \$200 million).

(5) Providing a \$50 million revolving fund under the special assistance program to support FHA section 203 (1) loans. Section 203 (1) loans are designed to encourage low-cost housing in outlying and rural areas.

(6) Amending the present revolving fund for section 213 mortgages to make it clear that the \$5 million limit per State is on outstanding commitments; in other words to make clear that the State suballocation can "revolve" exactly the same as does the \$50 million nationwide revolving fund.

(7) Exempting from the \$15,000 limit on loans eligible for purchase the following: (a) Military housing loans insured under section 803 and (b) FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans made in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

Section 202 would establish a new secondary market support program for GI loans.

Under its provisions the Secretary of the Treasury could invest up to 10 percent of the reserves of the national service life insurance fund by purchasing VA-guaranteed loans in geographic areas where discounts on GI loans are heaviest. Both current reserves and future premiums could be used. Since the fund's reserves are approximately \$5½ billion, the program could supply approximately \$550 million in funds to support the market.

Only loans guaranteed after enactment would be eligible for purchase. In case of serious default, provision is made for purchase of the defaulted loan from the fund by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The program would expire on July 25, 1957, the present expiration date for the GI loan benefit of most World War II veterans.

The Federal National Mortgage Association would act as the Treasury's agent to purchase and service loans. Payment for such services is limited to a maximum of three-fourths of 1 percent. Since the GI loans purchased would yield at least 4½ percent, the fund would earn a minimum of 3¾ percent on its mortgage portfolio.

#### TITLE III—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Sections 301, 302, 303, and 304 would establish a new loan program for housing for the elderly, similar to the college housing loan program.

These sections would provide \$250 million to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for loans to nonprofit corporations for the construction or rehabilitation of housing for the elderly.

The interest rate could not exceed 3½ percent per annum and the maximum loan term would be 50 years. The cost of funds to the Administrator from the Treasury could not exceed 3 percent.

The bill would permit loans only when private capital is not available upon the terms and conditions provided in the bill.

#### TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 401 would increase the funds available under present law for capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal projects by an additional \$1 billion. The sum would be made available in \$500 million increments on July 1, 1956, and July 1, 1957.

Section 402 the Housing Administrator would be authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

Section 403 the urban planning grant authorization would be increased from \$5 million to \$10 million.

Section 404 would extend to private nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning the same privilege with respect to Government construction planning advances, as that now enjoyed by tax-supported educational institutions of higher learning. Both such types of educational institutions receive equal consideration under provisions of the college housing loans program, and this change would place them on a parity with respect to planning advances.

#### TITLE V—PUBLIC HOUSING

Section 501 would provide 50,000 low-rent public-housing units annually for a 3-year period beginning August 1, 1956. Provi-

sion is made for carrying over to subsequent years any unused portion of the annual quota.

Section 502 would make low-rent public housing available to elderly persons (65 years or over)—

(1) By making elderly single persons eligible.

(2) By authorizing the construction of units specifically designed for elderly persons. The section provides 10,000 units annually for a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1956.

(3) By increasing the permissible per room cost for units for elderly persons to \$2,250 (present ceiling, \$1,750).

Section 503. The Public Housing Administration would be directed to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies in the areas of the camps if requested within 12 months after enactment of the bill and the local public housing agency certifies as to the low-rent need for the project and that preferences will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and, second, to other low-income persons and families.

Section 504 would authorize the sale under prescribed conditions of two Government-owned projects, the Chiquapin Village housing project in Alexandria, Va., and the Techwood Dormitory in Atlanta, Ga.

#### TITLE VI—FARM HOUSING

Section 601 amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide the following additional authorizations for loans and contributions to farm housing:

(1) \$100 million in the amount of loan funds which can be obtained from the Treasury;

(2) \$2 million per annum in the amount of annual contribution commitments for housing on potentially adequate farms; and

(3) \$10 million in the amount of appropriations authorized for loans and grants for improvements and repairs of farm housing.

#### TITLE VII—COLLEGE HOUSING

Section 701 would increase loan funds for college housing by \$250 million, bringing the total authorized for such purpose to \$750 million.

#### TITLE VIII—MILITARY HOUSING

Section 801 would extend and liberalize the title VIII military housing program by—

(1) Extending the program until September 1959 (under present law the program would expire September 30, 1956).

(2) Permitting an average cost per dwelling unit of \$15,000 (presently \$13,500) and up to \$16,500 in high-cost areas as determined by the Secretary of Defense. The aggregate total of mortgage insurance authorized would be increased correspondingly.

(3) Permitting the FHA Commissioner to waive or reduce the FHA insurance premium.

(4) Prescribing maximum floor area limitations for various ranks and grades with a special allowance for quarters outside the United States and for the quarters of commanding officers.

(5) Extending eligibility for military housing insurance to the Canal Zone.

### Disarmament

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 27, 1956, I addressed the Conference of Organizations on the United

Nations, called by the American Association for the United Nations, on the subject of disarmament. I ask unanimous consent to have this speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, AT THE SECTION MEETING ON DISARMAMENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS ON THE UNITED NATIONS, CALLED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, FEBRUARY 27, 1956, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Chairman Bolte, Mrs. Roosevelt, Governor Stassen, and friends, it is a particular pleasure to be here today with you and to share this platform both with the President's personal representative in the field of disarmament and with the leaders of the great organizations throughout this country that are dedicating their talents and energies to these problems of overriding international importance. I see many friends in this audience; representatives from every area of American life—labor, business, agriculture, the professions, and our great organizations of fraternal and religious faith. Regardless of your particular interests, you are here because you believe that our country and its freedoms would not survive without a citizenship that was well informed. You are here to inform yourselves through your own deliberations and then to take that information back to the groups you represent. I know that you do not have to be recommissioned for that assignment, but it seems to me tremendously important that the flow of information to your constituency be most certain and most comprehensive. The job of our Government would be far more difficult if it were not for people with a sense of community responsibility—people who are at work constantly alerting and informing the public. Just as you have helped to inform others, including Senators and appointees of the President, it is the obligation of your Government to provide accurate and detailed information on all matters of foreign policy, national security and disarmament.

I say this in connection with all the manifold problems of national and international policy which now confront us. During the past few days you have been canvassing the broad issues of economic development, collective security, atoms for peace, and colonialism. Today we are turning our attention to the opportunity and the challenge of disarmament, but in doing so, I know we will not forget how interrelated all of these problems are.

This interrelationship was frankly recognized 13 years ago at the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco. The new world organization was dedicated not only to a peaceful world, but to a better world. Everyone acknowledged that security alone was not enough, even though progress in the long run would be impossible without it. Thus article 1 of the United Nations Charter spelled out the two major goals of the United Nations as follows:

1. "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

2. "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character."

Thus, there was an early admission that security alone was too hollow an objective. The delegates to the founding conference at San Francisco in 1945 knew in their hearts that security has meaning primarily for those who have something to preserve.

Therefore, as we concentrate on this subject of disarmament, let us never forget that



there are other immediate everyday problems that are simultaneously stirring the hearts and hopes of men and women throughout the world. If disarmament itself is to make any headway, people everywhere must have a clear idea of the kind of world that a disarmed world might be. There must be a great incentive. If the net effect of disarmament would be to freeze the status quo, to stifle change, to prevent the correction of existing abuses, much of its attractiveness would fade away.

Actually the pathway to disarmament may very well involve utilizing the great international agencies such as WHO, UNESCO, FAO, the technical assistance programs, capital development programs—all of which have a way of firming up the economies of the nations of the world—so that our international mental health is more conducive to a sane, sensible discussion of the problems of disarmament.

We must always remember that we live and labor in a world of revolution. Protecting and enlarging the freedom of the two-thirds of the world which is still outside Communist control will take more than military alliances to which we seem to be unduly addicted. It will take more than a stockpile of bombs, and more than threats to use them. It is a false notion, though widely held, that today's tensions and torments are entirely caused by the Soviet drive for expansion and that military deterrents, therefore, are the chief answers.

Aggressive Communist designs are, to be sure, in the forefront of our current foreign policy predicament, but this Communist threat occurs in the midst of a world-wide revolution for freedom and for material progress. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and South America, forces are now at work which will rank among the great movements of history, as important as the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution.

More than a billion people are on their way to political self-determination, economic development, and human dignity. They are the so-called "underdeveloped nations" and many of them happen to be uncommitted to either side in the cold war.

The Communists have now recognized this Twentieth Century revolution and have sought to turn it to communism's advantage. They have sought to preempt it, to claim it, to own it, and to direct it. We, on the other hand, are today running grave risks of failing to take it adequately into account, and of failing to identify this revolution with our own historic tradition and continuing ideals.

Many of us have been deeply disturbed over the inadequacies of public understanding and of official policy on this new challenge now facing us. I am convinced, for example, that if we are to match the new Soviet political and economic offensive, we must reexamine and liberalize our approach to the underdeveloped—the uncommitted—nations of the world. In those nations the demands for self-government, human dignity, and economic progress are now irrefragable. We had better face up to that. Our own national history symbolizes these self-same demands. We will be faithless to our tradition if we neglect this new opportunity to help other nations reassert our common principles.

I am sure that the uncommitted peoples of the world have been impressed during the last few days with the President's dramatic step forward in sharing "atoms for peace." Let us hope, however, that our approach to peaceful atomic assistance to other nations will proceed within the framework of the United Nations. The President himself, in his famous "atoms for peace" speech to the General Assembly in December 1953, said that he "would expect that (an international atomic energy agency) would be

set up under the aegis of the United Nations." We all know that bilateral arrangements may be helpful and at times essential. But I think it would be a mistake to concentrate on these bilateral arrangements as an exclusive pattern for atomic assistance. Too much bilateralism can detract from, and ultimately erode, the multilateral concepts which are the foundation of the United Nations.

The atoms for peace proposals are important to disarmament, too, because they foreshadow the kind of life that a peaceful, disarmed world would allow to mankind.

In turning to a discussion of disarmament itself, therefore, let us remember that neither it, nor the other problems that we have just mentioned, can be pursued in a vacuum. That is what is meant too by the warning which we frequently hear, that large-scale political settlements are the prerequisite to progress on disarmament.

It is a legitimate question to ask whether it is possible to think seriously of disarmament so long as the great powers find no ground for agreement on the basic issues that divide them. It is tempting, of course, especially after the many disappointments that we have suffered, to answer "No" to this question at the outset and let it go at that. We have had ample disillusionment in the past when disarmament negotiations have had to be broken off during the tension-ridden periods of the Berlin blockade and the Korean war.

It is quite true, therefore, that chances for disarmament may depend in part on the climate of the world political situation. It may be true, as some say, that no disarmament agreement can possibly be negotiated without a political settlement of the German question or the Formosan Straits question.

But to this question, as to most important questions, there is no simple answer. Undoubtedly, the prospects for disarmament are curtailed by the presence of thorny, unanswered political problems. It is equally true, however, that there are crucial divergencies of interests, important diplomatic conflicts, that cannot be solved, either, as long as the armament race goes on. It can be argued that they in turn cannot be brought close to a solution until the framework of a disarmament agreement is firmly established. I know that every person in this room is acutely aware of the danger of war which continues to confront us. I think we know or sense that another war, if it comes, may well destroy our civilization. Is it any wonder that people in this country are united in a deep revulsion to war? This revulsion is shared by people in Europe and Asia and elsewhere. I believe that it is shared by the peoples of the Soviet Union. It may be that an awareness of this revulsion has even penetrated the walls of the Kremlin. Mr. Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party indicates that he is beginning to appreciate the fact—one which was not, may I say, recognized by his predecessor, Mr. Stalin—that it will not be capitalist countries alone which will be blown up in an atomic war.

This universal abhorrence of war gives us a base to build on. It does not, however, guarantee that we shall avoid a tragic conflict. We must come to grips with the specific problems which lead us to war. One of these problems is the rapid increase of armaments and the incredible increase in their destructive capacity.

It was a concern with this aspect of the problem that led me to introduce Senate Resolution 93, which set up a special Subcommittee on Disarmament. The challenge of this undertaking is enormous. I do not have any simple answers any more than do Mr. Stassen and the dozens of other people in the executive branch of the Government who are working on this problem. The work

of the subcommittee has just begun. Certain fundamental principles, however, have already started to emerge. They are the principles which I believe should govern our approach to the problem of disarmament.

First, any disarmament agreement or proposal must, of course, protect the national security of the United States and other nations. It cannot have loopholes which give a potential aggressor the advantage he needs to start a war and to win it. Each proposal must be carefully examined before we can be sure that our national security will be preserved. And what we do ourselves we must expect others to do. Protection of the national security is a function of all governments. We can expect others to pursue it at least as zealously as we do ourselves. I do not question their right to do so. I simply stress that we must be equally aware not only of our right but of our duty in this respect.

The protection of national security leads us directly to the second principle which must operate in disarmament negotiations. It is this: No proposal, no matter how good it looks and regardless of who proposes it, should lead us to let down our guard. Until the agreement or agreements are signed by all the necessary parties, until they can go into effect—and prove their effectiveness—the United States and its allies throughout the free world must maintain their proportionate defensive strength.

We cannot let the lofty words, our own or anyone else's, tempt us to think that now is the time to reduce essential expenditures for national defense when there is no armament reduction agreement. The time to disarm is after the agreement to disarm, and not before. No matter how appealing a balanced budget, it must not be pursued, as it appears to me it is now being pursued, at the risk of jeopardizing our capacity for defense or weakening friendly nations abroad.

I might add here that the actions of the United States in all of these areas—economic, military, and political—tend to set the pace. If allied nations see us thinking and acting primarily in terms of economy, they are likely to follow suit. If we shirk our responsibilities, they will do the same. Leadership imposes responsibility to lead—to set the pace—to establish the standards and the guidelines by clear and unmistakable policies and performance. I have yet to see the clear outlines of American policy on many vital subjects.

The third principle has to do with perhaps the most vital element in the maintenance of a democratic and self-governing society. This is the principle of an informed public. I know and you know that the men who are conducting disarmament negotiations, and planning military, atomic, and foreign policy are loyal citizens who have the interests of their country at heart. But they are not omnipotent. They are men with all of the limitations and weaknesses of men. They are not the sole judges as to what facts we should have and what developments might disturb us and discourage us from thinking that all is not well in the world. I have never thought that I needed to be spoon-fed by public relations men and neither do the American people feel that they need to be spoon-fed. Possibly we can't know everything that is going on, but we do need to know a lot more than we know now. There is a tendency here in America today, not only on questions of disarmament, but in virtually every activity of our Government to clamp the secrecy label on far too many items, to keep facts bottled up even after they are revealed and known in many other parts of the world.

The special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, hopes to conduct virtually all of its work in full

public view. There are far too many executive sessions in this city, ladies and gentlemen. There needs to be more open discussion. As chairman of this subcommittee, I intend to do everything I can to see to it that the important facts, the legitimate information on all phases of this subject, are published and made available and understandable to all Members of the Senate, and through them to the American people.

The fourth principle which must guide our approach to disarmament is sincerity—sincerity of purpose. By its very nature, the Soviet system of communism produces men fanatically clever in the art of deception, hypocrisy, and duplicity. There is always a danger that as a result of our frustrating experience of trying to deal with them, some of those responsible for carrying out our policy may tend to take on some of these same characteristics. In our struggle against communism we must be careful not to ape the totalitarian. In our efforts to win this great struggle against forces of tyranny, let us not take on the manners and the habits of the tyrant. Psychological warriors are not going to win either a war or a peace. They may win skirmishes, but they do so at the risk of losing for us the great issues. I should not like to see the day when this country begins to use words in matters of life and death in the fashion of the advertisers. There is no brand name for peace; it can't be spelled backwards. The peace and disarmament proposals which this country makes must be supported by the full conviction that they are workable, plausible, and that they will genuinely contribute to a solution of the basic problem.

As I see it, therefore, the efforts for disarmament are being advanced on three fronts: In the United Nations, the executive branch of our Government, and the Congress of the United States. All of these are essential, if our hopes for effective control and restriction of armaments are to be realized as a practical achievement. The details of what is going on within the first two fronts come to me, as to you, from published reports, statements of our official representatives, and through the newspapers. Many of you have also had reports from your own official observers at the United Nations and your legislative representatives here in Washington. So if I concentrate the rest of my remarks on the Senate work and my views of what we may do, I hope you will understand why, because you have possibly much more information about the first two fronts than I have myself. I would hope that my good friend, Governor Stassen, would see to it that the executive branch does a little more proposing for us and for the world in this field of disarmament. Because after all the executive branch conducts the foreign policy of the United States and the Senate would have little opportunity to dispose if the executive branch never proposed.

With respect to the role of the United Nations, I am saying nothing new to this group when I say that we would not know nearly as much as we do today about the problems of disarmament and the efforts required to attain it if it were not for the United Nations.

But I am here in my capacity as a member of the Senate. It is well to remember that even if the executive branch came forth with brilliant plans, unassailable in their logic, and even if they were accepted by all of the members of the United Nations, they could not come into effect without the participation of the Congress of the United States. Now this is not to try to overawe you with our importance. It is merely to point up an essential feature of our constitutional system. It is also to remind you that the Senate cannot act effectively unless it is fully informed and has sufficient information to render sound judgments. This is the principal reason why last June, I introduced Senate Resolution 93 setting up this special Subcommittee on Disarmament.

The Senate cannot do the negotiating with foreign powers on the subject of disarmament. But we are a vehicle to make certain that the agreements reached will fulfill the needs of the American people and meet the test of acceptability by them. Furthermore, we in the Congress are a means through which the American people have an opportunity to express their views, their hopes, yes, even, their doubts of disarmament, and through which they may learn how present disarmament proposals can affect their future lives.

Now, a few words about this special committee. It is bipartisan: 12 members, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats. It would be premature to speculate now on the conclusions we may reach. But at the present time the subcommittee has three lines of approach.

First, we intend to have members of the executive branch discuss at public hearings the Government's policy on disarmament and to give us their appraisal of the possibilities of reaching a solution. Governor Stassen led the witnesses with his opening presentation on January 25. He will be followed on Wednesday of this week, February 29, by the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. On March 7, Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, will appear. On that same day, one of my colleagues, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, will testify before the subcommittee. He has, as you know, dedicated much of his life to the disarmament cause. On March 15, these gentlemen will be followed by Secretary of Defense Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who will bring to us the critically important views of the Defense Establishment.

Then the subcommittee's second line of approach will be to hold hearings both here and outside of Washington so that we may have the benefit of the views of experts and informed, interested private organizations and citizens. These hearings, I believe, will be somewhat unique. They will be in two parts. The first part of the hearing will consist of testimony from experts, largely men and women at our universities who have made a special study of disarmament. They will be asked to summarize the results of their research and study and pool their knowledge in an effort to assist us in our work. The second part of the hearings will be devoted to those individuals and groups who wish to present their views to the subcommittee. We need to have a good cross-section of the ideas of the people of the United States on this question in all parts of the country and we intend, if possible, to go out and get it.

The third approach of the subcommittee is to commission a series of staff studies. Each will present an aspect of the problem of control and reduction of armaments. We hope that these studies will assist us and other interested Americans to understand more clearly the dimensions of the disarmament problem and the issues which arise from it. The first of these studies has already been published. It deals with the organization of the executive branch to handle disarmament questions. That study itself revealed some of the problems.

For example, I came to sympathize with Governor Stassen in his responsibility. In addition to the Governor's office, 3 executive departments with numerous subbureaus, 2 agencies, 1 commission, 1 mission, 1 council, and 2 boards are involved in disarmament matters.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Departments of Defense, State, and Justice; Central Intelligence Agency; United States Information Agency; Atomic Energy Commission; United States Mission to the United Nations; National Security Council; Planning Board and Operations Coordinating Board of the National Security Council.

I hope that while you follow the work of this subcommittee you will also help us. I hope you will make known to us the conclusions that you reach here at this meeting, and I solicit these conclusions and recommendations. As leaders of some of the most important organizations serving the public interest there are contributions you definitely can make to peace and security of the world.

First, you can help by continuing to keep informed. I want to emphasize again that there are no shortcuts. There is a good deal of homework that has to be done by the American people in these crucial areas of national security, foreign policy and disarmament.

Second, you can help bring a sense of realism to the consideration of disarmament by reminding your members of the real dilemma posed by this question. One horn of the dilemma is that we cannot hope to have real peace so long as we and the rest of the world race to build more deadly weapons. The other is that we must not be led or tricked into unilateral disarmament which leaves us and the other free nations defenseless against a potential aggressor.

A third contribution you can make is to caution patience. Disarmament is as hard a problem as we have in the entire field of foreign policy. We Americans have often tended to believe that each defined problem carries with it a possible solution. In the disarmament field, that might not be true even if each nation would define the problems the same way. A difficulty with disarmament, however, seems to be that definitions are often as lacking as solutions.

Patience can be helpful in this process. Perhaps patience will help in connection with the President's aerial inspection plan. The Government first talked about this in 1946.<sup>2</sup> In 1952 our deputy representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, described the use of aerial survey in a working paper submitted to the Commission on "Proposals for Progressive and Continuing Disclosure and Verification of Armed Forces and Armaments." Now the idea has been brought back to life in a somewhat different context. Perhaps patience will gain acceptability for it. That remains to be seen.

But patience is not an excuse for inaction or indifference. You are going to be discussing disarmament later on in small groups. I'd like to pose some questions for you to consider. They won't necessarily be easily answered. Perhaps some cannot be answered at all at this time. But they are questions which I have been asking myself, which my mail reveals, and which I would like to share with you.

Take, for example, the President's aerial inspection plan.

Can aerial reconnaissance alone detect each and every military maneuver of another country? If it can't, are we in possible trouble by proposing it or our accepting it? Should aerial inspection include the entire area in which a potential enemy has control or has control or has bases or has alliances? Even if we reach agreement on the principle of aerial inspection, some commentators contend that it is not fool-proof since there is no ostensible difference between a flight or bombers taking off on a training mission and one taking off with a load of H-bombs in the bomb shafts.

It has been suggested that progress on an overall plan for the reduction and control of armaments must be suspended until a way can be found to detect nuclear weapons which have been previously manufactured and then hidden. Does this mean we have to give up on trying to reach agreement on armed forces and conventional weapons too?

<sup>2</sup> Description of aerial inspection contained in the First Report of the U. N. Atomic Energy Commission, 1946.



The aerial inspection plan is called a beginning. I believe it was said to be a gateway. Is this the only beginning that can be made? Are we to stand with this one proposal committing ourselves almost entirely to this one to the exclusion of others? We are told some of the best brains in the Government are working on this problem, but we have no plan except a proposal which is said at best to prevent a surprise atomic attack between two countries. And I want you to ponder that for a moment. The plan that we have today, which seems to be the core of the American disarmament proposal, if you can call it disarmament, is one merely of being able to ascertain what the participants may do to apprehend an attack.

The world applauded the President's initiative in making the open-skies proposal at the summit conference. But there have been indications since that the world is somewhat worried about our sense of follow-through. For instance, the distinguished French representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, Mr. Jules Moch, has flatly stated: "Never have I believed that a formula for control without disarmament would receive the unanimous support of the governments—any more than a formula for disarmament without control."

Mr. Moch himself has proposed a three-point objective for further disarmament conversations: (1) no control without disarmament; (2) no disarmament without control; but (3) step by step, disarmament over all activities that can be controlled.

It is my personal conviction that the situation requires a reexamination at least on the part of the western representatives at the new London conference, of all of the major proposals put forward by President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden, and the then Premier of France—Premier Faure—at the summit conference last July.

If we ever expect disarmament to come, we need the world working with us. We do not seem to have the world working with us now, as hard as it might. In all humility, I do not think we are pushing ourselves on this issue as hard as we should.

The Picasso peace dove symbolizes the beguiling success which the Soviet peace campaign has had in many areas of the world. Strangely enough among many millions of non-Communist people, the popular impression today is that the Soviet Union, not the United States, has been most insistent on halting the arms race. No impression could be more damaging to America's prestige abroad. And, of course, no impression could be more false. But, as one who has been in politics, I have found much—sometimes to my sorrow—that what people believe is not always the truth.

Since 1947 when the Soviet threat of aggression and subversion became fully evident to us, American policymakers have assumed that its nature and dimensions were equally evident to others. This led us seriously to underrate the effectiveness of Russian propaganda on peace and disarmament. The fact that much of the world has forgotten our own early imaginative proposals for atomic energy control and disarmament—and we were the first nation to make these proposals—is indicative of a major failure of our information program in recent years. It may also be indicative of the fact that louder and more strident voices have talked about dropping bombs and using massive retaliation rather than constantly emphasizing the potentialities of peace.

Let us reassert our leadership on this matter all along the line. We need the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations with us on this great issue of disarmament. I don't think we can make real progress without their help.

We are reassured that other nations are with us because they voted overwhelmingly

in the United Nations General Assembly for the United States resolution on aerial inspection. But what are they themselves doing on this question? Have we encouraged them to make as full a contribution to the solution of this problem as we might? These questions are not rhetorical. They are asked in a most earnest search for help on this key issue. I shall be interested to see what your discussions produce.

In military language defense is often spoken of in terms of the long pull ahead. Well, I want to close on the theme of the long pull ahead for peace.

It is a mistake, in my judgment, to say that we are going to get disarmament this year or next year or the year after. It is a mistake to paint a smilingly optimistic picture of the prospects for peace. The disarmament problem, much less the total problem of peace, is not going to be solved either by wishful thinking by advertising or by half-hearted attempts. It will require hard work—sacrificial labor—at many points. It will require some fresh bearings for our foreign policy. I am confident, however, that if all of us in all sincerity devote our efforts to this question—if the people whose stake in this matter is life itself, if you who represent so many groups who have devoted years to the problem of world peace, if Governor Stassen with the boards and agencies of the executive branch, if the Senate and last but not the least, the United Nations—if all of us pull together we can begin to frame our hopes for peace with the realities of peace. We can give substance to the words of a man with whom I have not always agreed, but with whose words I should like to close.

In his remarkable speech before an American Legion convention in Los Angeles a year ago, Gen. Douglas MacArthur forcefully stated the central challenge ahead. He said: "We are in a new era. Old methods no longer suffice. We must break out of the strait-jacket of the past. There must always be one to lead, and we should be that one. We should now proclaim our readiness in concert with the great powers of the world to abolish war. The result might be magical."

Indeed, it might.

### Address of Vice President Nixon Before Brand Names Day Dinner

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Nixon today delivered a most interesting and inspiring address before the Brand Names Day dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. I urge all my colleagues to read the Vice President's excellent and careful analysis of the leadership of President Eisenhower and his administration.

The address follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE BRAND NAMES DAY DINNER, THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 18, 1956

May I first join with you in congratulating the Brand Name Retailer-of-the-Year Awards winners. Before the evening is over, I hope to have the opportunity to meet and congratulate each one of you personally for the achievement so justifiably recognized this evening.

I must admit at the outset that I have had some difficulty in selecting an appropriate subject for this gathering.

A speaker should usually direct his remarks to a subject of particular interest to the organization which he is addressing. Unfortunately, my knowledge of the businesses and other organizations represented at this dinner is limited to that of the millions of Americans to whom brand names are household words.

It is true that I have had experience on both sides of the counter in that respect, having grown up in a family which operated one of those old-fashioned general merchandise stores.

And, as one who has sold products, as well as purchased them, I know you can't sell something unless you know what you are talking about.

That's why well-advertised, brand-name products were easier to sell. I knew about them, my customers usually did also, and less sales talk was necessary.

That's why I have tonight selected a subject I know something about—the record and philosophy of the Eisenhower administration.

I want to admit at the outset that my views will necessarily be biased by the fact that I am a member of the administration.

But I don't believe I am being partisan or prejudiced when I say that most Americans, regardless of party affiliations, are grateful to the man whose leadership has brought peace and unparalleled prosperity to America, and honesty, dignity, and integrity to Government in Washington, D. C.

In fact, the problem I was confronted with tonight, as always, was to select which field of accomplishment to discuss in the limited time I have.

With your permission, I should like to direct my remarks to the economic policies of this administration in terms of what they are, what they have accomplished, and what we can expect for the future.

We immediately are confronted with a problem with which you are far more familiar than I—what to call this policy—its brand name if you please. Because the Eisenhower economic policies which have been in effect for the past 3 years have been called from time to time both conservative and liberal, both Republican and Democrat, both Old Deal and New Deal, both moderate and radical.

As you know, better than I, in the final analysis, it isn't the name but the product that counts.

No better proof of the application of this truth in the field of politics could be found than an event that occurred last week.

Thomas Jefferson's birthday was celebrated on Friday, April 13. Democratic orators all over the country hailed him as a member of their party. But a study of history reveals that Thomas Jefferson was elected President in 1800 as the candidate of the Republican Party.

And when we consider his devotion to the rights of individuals and of the States, and his opposition to too much power in the Federal Government, I do not believe I am overstepping the bounds of objectivity when I say that if Jefferson were alive today he would probably be an Eisenhower Republican.

Therefore, before we can brand this policy we must examine the programs which have been executed under it, the results of those programs, and the philosophies behind them.

In January 1953 the President and his Cabinet were confronted with a basic and difficult decision in the field of economic policy. Here is what we found when we came into office:

Taxes and spending were at record peacetime rates.

Controls shackled the economy and more were being advocated.

Various messages to Congress by the President's predecessor had urged the adoption of

new programs in the fields of education, health, housing, agriculture, and power which would have carried the national economy further down the road to nationalization, federalization, and, in some instances, socialization of basic American institutions.

The decision we had to make was this—should we drift with what seemed to be the wave of the future or should we turn to more conservative policies?

Purely apart from the principle involved, there were strong political arguments for allowing things to go on as they were. Because, whether we like it or not, we must recognize that millions of Americans lost faith in conservative economic policies as a result of the great depression of the thirties.

They were convinced that those policies had brought on the depression. And they feared that a return to those policies might bring on another depression.

The problem was thoroughly debated in the Cabinet, and, finally, a basic decision was made.

In essence, we decided to give the free American economic system a chance to work. We based that decision on our faith that conservative policies were right in principle, and that if they were right in principle they would, in the end, prove right politically.

To implement that decision—

We removed controls from the economy.

We got the Government out of business, rather than putting it in.

We cut spending.

We cut taxes.

We adopted fiscal policies designed to encourage the initiative, the dynamism, and the ingenuity of the American people.

It will be many years before an accurate and objective appraisal of the major accomplishments of this administration can be made.

But I submit that when the history of this administration is finally written, no accomplishment will have been more significant, or more in the interests of the great majority of the American people than this: The danger of America following some of our friends abroad down the road which leads inevitably to socialization or nationalization of our institutions has been averted and the faith of the American people in businesslike, conservative conduct of Government economic policies has been restored.

Statistics are invariably dull. But, just for a moment, let us look at the record in terms of what has been accomplished.

Gross national product, personal income, labor income, savings deposits, retail sales are at all time highs. For the first time in recent history, the United States has enjoyed over 3 consecutive years of high prosperity, and records are being broken almost as fast as they are made.

Furthermore, we are not using rubber dollars as our measuring rods. When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, the index of living costs compiled by the Department of Labor stood at the level of 113.4. Three years later, the level was 114.6, a rise of 1 percent. Compare this if you will with the record of the 4 years preceding this administration when the rise was over 11 percent.

This means that today when wages go up, the profits increase, there is a real gain, not merely a money rise that is canceled out by higher prices. The tremendous increase in almost every sector of economic life is sound and well grounded.

I realize that sometimes our political opponents charge that this is a business administration. If they mean by this that government is running efficiently and well, we plead guilty to the charge.

We have done our best to give the country a good example of economy, industry, and integrity in the handling of Government affairs.

But, if the charge means that we favor the interests of business to the exclusion of

other groups of the economy, we suggest that all Americans look at the record.

In 1952, there were those who said, "You have never had it so good." But let us make some comparisons between 1952 and 1955, not in terms of the economy as a whole, but in terms of the 65 million American wage earners.

In 1952, the average gross weekly earnings of a factory worker was \$67. At present, it is \$78.

In 1952, the take-home pay of the average factory worker with three dependents was \$56. Today it is \$62.

In 1950, 20 million persons owned their home. Today, 24 million homes are owner-occupied—an increase from 53 percent in 1950 to 58 percent in 1955.

The average life insurance policy in force per family has increased from \$5,300 in 1952 to \$6,300 in 1955.

What these figures mean is that wage earners today are better off than at any time in the entire history of the Nation.

How did this unprecedented prosperity come about?

From a political standpoint I would like to be able to claim all the credit for my party and the Government policies this administration has instituted during the past 3 years.

But to do so would not only be historically inaccurate; it would miss the great secret of America's economic progress from the time of our foundation.

What we must recognize is that under our system governments do not create wealth—people do.

We know that, in all fairness, the credit for America's great prosperity today must be shared among Democrats and Republicans, labor leaders and business executives, farmers and city folk, alike. Together they have brought about the changes that have made our economic system the model that it is today. In a real sense the achieving of the American dream has been the combined work of all Americans.

Yet, without in any way detracting from the other factors I have mentioned, I think I can state without fear of contradiction that the philosophy of government that has prevailed in Washington for the last 3 years has been the most important single factor in producing the good times we enjoy today.

That philosophy is not easy to describe. There are many who ask what the difference is between the Eisenhower economic policies and those of the administrations which preceded this one.

The difference is not in goals. All Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, want better schools, housing, jobs, medical care, and more progress for all our citizens.

The difference is in means—how we achieve these goals.

And, as far as the difference in means is concerned, the difference is in where we start.

The administrations which immediately preceded the Eisenhower administration in Washington assumed in virtually every instance that Federal Government action was the answer to all social and economic problems. If more jobs were needed, the Government should create them. If better medical care was desired, the Government should provide it, and so on down the line.

In other words, they believed that if there was a social or economic problem to meet, the way to meet it was to begin with the Federal Government and work down.

We, in this administration, have exactly the opposite point of view. We say that the most effective way to meet social and economic goals is to begin with the individual and work up. We believe the Federal Government should step in only where individual action or State and local action is inadequate to do the job.

We hold to this view not only because we believe that individual action should always

be encouraged rather than repressed under our system of government, but for the very practical reason that we know that in the long run this is the best way to meet social and economic goals.

Because, though whenever something needs to be done it always sounds easy to suggest that the Federal Government will do it, the difficulty generally with such programs is that they won't work.

For example, over the next 10 years, it is estimated that to keep pace with our growing population and insure continued progress and prosperity, we shall have to spend approximately \$180 billion for schools, hospitals, power installations, roads, and slum clearance.

To meet these goals we must tap all the resources of America. If the Federal Government were to step in and assume full responsibility, State, local, and individual action would shrivel up.

That is why the Eisenhower Federal partnership program, which encourages State and individual action, will succeed where a program of Federal paternalism would fail.

We now come to a problem which I am sure will intrigue those in attendance at this brand names dinner: What do we call the economic philosophy of this administration which I have been describing?

I have used the word "conservative" tonight in describing it, but I realize that "conservative" during the early days of the Republic referred to those who advocated more power in the Federal Government. Now it tends to mean almost the opposite.

"Capitalism" is another word which is often used to describe the economic philosophy of this administration, but certainly the capitalism we have in the United States today is very unlike the capitalism we knew 50 years ago, or that which still prevails in some other parts of the world.

If it is capitalism, the term "consumers' capitalism" or "people's capitalism" would be perhaps more appropriate.

Ours is a capitalism in which owners, management, workers, the general public, and consumers participate and share.

We have witnessed a dispersal of economic power in the United States on a truly democratic scale. Main Street has displaced Wall Street as the controlling and dynamic force behind American capitalism.

The terms "middle of the road" and "moderation" have often been used to describe the administration's philosophy.

Does this mean, as the extremists contend, lack of firm principles in dealing with economic and social problems?

Certainly not. Because when we speak of "moderation" and "middle of the road" we are not speaking merely of a compromise between the left and the right.

Ours is a new approach to political economy.

Extreme individualism has rendered a great service in developing the Nation, but, in the process, it has rendered itself obsolete.

On the other hand, exclusive emphasis on Government action to meet social and economic needs, we find, inevitably leads to loss of freedom.

What then is the alternative?

What we have sought and what we believe we have found is not a compromise, but a living and dynamic synthesis.

In the past, private initiative had been primarily confined to the economic field and selfish ends.

But the mistake of those who opposed it was that they tried to liquidate private initiative, rather than to redirect its ends.

Social goals are of utmost importance, but the individual must remain the agent of his own destiny.

The middle way is to expand private initiative for social goals. We believe that private initiative is the dominant social force in a free society.



That is why in finding solutions to social and economic problems we always begin by exploring whether the problem can be handled by private initiative.

The role of government is to help the individual—not to make decisions for him.

Russell Davenport in his penetrating analysis of the American economic scene, "The Dignity of Man," which he left unfinished at his death, summarized this philosophy in these words: "No solution of any problem in a free way of life should be provided by calling upon the State to undertake tasks which under proper circumstances of education and encouragement citizens themselves can do."

In summary, what this little excursion into philosophy means to me is simply this. America is a great Nation today because our Founding Fathers recognized the supreme importance of the individual dignity of men and women. And, any administration which bases its policies on that fundamental precept, whether it be Democrat or Republican, whether it be called liberal or conservative, will help to make the American dream come true.

Less than 2 years ago President Eisenhower predicted that within 10 years economic production would reach a level of \$500 billion in dollars of constant value. Many persons thought he was too optimistic when he made that prediction. But now it appears that we may attain this goal several years sooner.

This is not a wild prediction. I am simply projecting the rate of growth that we have recently been enjoying.

For all this, I repeat, the Eisenhower economic program deserves an important share of the credit.

The idea that government is the servant of the people is not a new idea, but the way that it has been applied in the last 3 years is new, and we are all better for it.

We have seen something rare in American political history—a government that is really dedicated to helping all the people—a government that rises above political considerations and class interests, and judges all its programs by one, and only one, norm—does this benefit all Americans, does it recognize, conserve, and protect the inherent dignity of every man, woman, and child in America?

As long as this is our goal and our philosophy, we can look forward with confidence to a fuller, richer, and brighter future for all Americans.

## First Anniversary of the African-Asian Conference

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the African-Asian Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia. I was privileged to be present. I rise today to commemorate that occasion by addressing myself to the problem of how we can win the uncommitted nations.

The uncommitted nations are centralized in southeast Asia. Southeast Asia is important because of its geographical location athwart communications and its enormous wealth in natural resources. Its manpower is capable of contributing significantly to world peace and prosperity.

Today all shipping between Europe and the Orient via the Indian Ocean must pass through either the Strait of Malacca or the Strait of Sunda. Control of these two southeast Asian straits gives dominance over a sea route that is comparable in importance to the Panama Canal route.

Furthermore, all intercontinental airways in the Far East traverse the southeast Asian area.

The successful advance of communism through China and well into northern Vietnam threatens the remaining southeast Asian countries with a more deadly form of colonialism than any the world has ever known. Extension of Communist control over the remainder of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma, which together form Asia's rice bowl, would place most of the independent Asian nations in mortal danger. India, Ceylon, Japan, and Malaya, which are dependent upon that rice bowl for life itself, would have access to it only on Communist terms.

It was because of this that despite the attempts of the Department of State to dissuade me that I went to the Bandung Conference, April 18, 1955.

Now, as regards the Bandung Conference, let me be very specific and point out that the United States of America per se did not come out on top. The idea of democracy most definitely did. For the first time in the history of the world the Asian and African countries had an opportunity to go on record as to whether they wanted democracy or communism and they voted overwhelmingly for democracy. Because the United States has been the foremost exponent of democracy through all the years we naturally basked in the reflected glory.

Now, democracy does not of necessity have to win again in Cairo in 1956. On a significant question such as the admission of Red China to the United Nations, I believe that the Bandung conferees would have voted 17 to 12 against Red China. On this basis, I would say that 17 out of the 29 nations were committed to the idea of democracy. The 17 nations will not of necessity continue on the side of democracy. Very definitely, at the Conference, Cambodia and Laos were wooed close to the neutralists' camp. The future of South Vietnam is in danger. It is just possible that when the Conference meets again the forces against democracy plus the forces that are uncommitted to democracy might be in the majority.

Never, therefore, has any nation in the history of the world been confronted with such a great problem and with so little time in which to solve it as ours. And yet the very suddenness of this impact upon our Western World might greatly assist us in making the idea of democracy globally triumphant. Forces in Asia are compelling us to accelerate the timetable of democracy. An outstanding American paper cabled one of their correspondents in the midst of the Bandung Conference asking this correspondent to find out what were the opinions of the delegates from Asia and Africa concerning the Supreme Court's implementation of the decree to bring about integration in the public school

system. This would be equivalent of asking an eastern Asian journalist in the United States to find out what the United States reaction was to the abolition of the untouchables in India or the signing of the agreement on dual citizenship of the Chinese and Indonesians. We know that these two questions were not explored in the slightest by correspondents here in the United States, but Bandung was of such importance that the American press wanted to know what was the attitude of the Chiefs of State of Asia and Africa on our own problem of racialism within our borders.

And so we come to this breathtaking moment when the United States of America, a modern colossus, stands astride western civilization with one foot at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the other foot at Fort Knox, Ky., holding in our hands more gold than any other nation owns and more atomic energy than any other nation controls. We feel that we are all powerful. We sense that we are invincible. The voice of conscience has died. Where is there the still small voice to tell us that no man has ever lived by bread alone?

Congressman WALTER JUDD, distinguished missionary to China for many years, told me this story when I came back from Bandung. A very great Chinese leader said to him one day, "Yes, we need gold from the United States but we also want the roses." We are not going to be able to buy friends even though we have all the gold at Fort Knox at our disposal. We are not going to be able to frighten people into being our friends even though we possess the A-bomb and the H-bomb.

What does gold mean to vast sections of Asia and Africa where for thousands of years hundreds of millions of people have never even seen a piece of silver?

The possession of nuclear weapons did not help us. The specter of the H-bomb haunted the halls of Bandung. No single thing has done more to destroy trust in us than the explosion of the A-bomb at Hiroshima and the continuing experiments in the South Pacific. In other words, the very things upon which we place all of our pride and all of our faith in the future—gold and atomic power—these are utterly meaningless in the Far East and when misused are actually Trojan horses within our camp.

The time is getting short. The caravan of democracy will succeed there only to the degree that it comes with roses; with complete equality and with complete dignity for all men.

Matthew Arnold stood on the beach of Dover one day when the hordes of nazism were poised on the other side of the English Channel ready to destroy that fair isle and penned these words:

We stand between 2 worlds, 1 world is dead and the other world has not yet been born.

Bandung was the womb from which the other world sprang. The President of Indonesia in his opening address called his address, Let a New Asia and a New Africa Be Born. And they were born: A potential for peace was unleashed by the peoples of the Far East. Now we have suddenly thrust upon us

full and certain knowledge that the old world is unmistakably dead, irretrievably gone. The shaping of the New World and the giving of content to it will no longer be monopolized by Western powers.

More than anything else our Christianity is on trial, too. The Asian-African Conference was a great parliament of the world's religions. The concept of brotherhood was stressed repeatedly. One speaker said:

If our religion, whatever it may be, does not allow us to get along with our brothers, regardless of what his religion may be, then our religion cannot be of much value.

Here in the United States, the forces of organized religion are still operating in a 19th century fashion in a 20th century world.

The powers of Caesar—the Supreme Court of the United States—have contributed much more effectively to the cause of brotherhood and to the cause of the recognition of the individual's worth than has the Christian church. Where the Supreme Court on one hand has abolished segregation in the public-school system, the United States of America still continues to practice segregation in its churches. The eminent Dr. Wade Mc-Kinney, of Cleveland, Ohio, said one day:

There is more segregation practiced in the United States of America at 11 a. m. on Sundays in our Protestant churches than at any other time in our Nation.

This then is the time for a great positive moral witness on each of us. We have lost this individual personal witness. We gave it over to the politicians in the field of civil rights. We abdicated our responsibility as churchmen to the paid professionals. Even though we go to church in droves, contributing as never before, we say "that paid professionals will take care of our religious responsibilities during the week," and we return to our ancient ruts of intolerance and prejudice.

The hour has been struck at Bandung for us to recapture our individual witness. The mantle of world leadership cannot become sheep's clothing. We must rise up and accept the responsibility regardless of the agonizing soul searching that must precede it.

We are a privileged people, privileged to live at one of the great crossroads that every now and then the force of history thrusts upon an unwilling world. Which way we should take depends entirely upon the individual choices made by American people up and down the main streets of our villages and hamlets and in our towns and cities. Capitol Hill cannot do it for us. The Supreme Court cannot be our personal witness. Individual, personal, moral witness must be made. The faith of our forefathers is not enough but the ferment of our forefathers is a deadly necessity.

And so, in far-off Indonesia on April 18, 1955, maybe America was brought back to the kind of arena that our forefathers lived in and died in. The men who stood at the rude arching bridge at Lexington and Concord were men dedicated to the idea of an individual witness. Black Crispus Attucks, striding across Boston Commons, refusing to bow

his head to British colonialism and dying—the first American to die for freedom—was a dedicated revolutionary.

Bandung sent us forth on our way to a new world. As we journey as pilgrims to these new meccas, we cannot journey blithely as tourists but we must walk with the full weight of destiny on our shoulders. We must walk with the awesome knowledge that we have become the appointed prophets of democracy, that if communism shall envelope the earth it will be because we failed in these testing years to give a bold and free and untrammelled witness to the idea and ideals of democracy.

Across the broad earth's surging breast there comes a cry of 1,400 million people, why cry, in the language of Donald Grant, for "admission to the front door of modern mankind." We are the guardians of that front door. The marks of the fraternity of modern mankind are decent clothes, minimum creature comforts, abolition of disease, no illiteracy and above all, no patronizing condescensions. This, the entire world, all humanity, is determined to have. If the United States of America, meaning you and I, do not let them in, they are going around to the back door where Soviet Russia with blandishments and enticements is urging them to come. They do not want to go in the back door unless we refuse to open the front door.

The weakest spots in our democratic offensive is the Department of State. Our Asian-African foreign policy is being given to us second-hand through the foreign offices of the English, French, Dutch and other colonial powers. In other words, we, the foremost exponent of democracy in the free world, are evaluating Asia and Africa through the eyes and ears of powers which are being pushed out of Asia and Africa as fast as the natives can do it. This is why we have been behind the eight ball in so many places such as Indochina and the same tragedy is being repeated in North Africa as we follow this 19th century policy.

On Monday, May 9, I met at a top level off-the-record meeting with the key people of our Department of State. I will not be breaking any security rule by saying that one of those present insisted that Bandung was an anti-white conference. I spent quite a little time disputing his point. When I saw the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, on Wednesday, May 11, I mentioned this to him. It is not permissible to quote the President of the United States; nevertheless, I can state that he pointed out that this State Department position could not be true because we had so many friends at Bandung standing up and fighting for the United States. This is an obvious fact to anyone.

How could Bandung be antiwhite when democracy came out on top and the majority of the delegates were praising the United Nations and the United States? And yet, after the Bandung Conference it was still the considered opinion of one of our top career men that Bandung was a conference against the white people. I do not discount the pos-

sibility that Bandung can develop through the years into an antiwhite conference. If it does it will be because we of the western Anglo-Saxon world refused to give them the equality and the dignity which they and God demand that all people should have.

Another great mistake in the operation of our Foreign Service is the steadfast refusal of the Department of State, under Democratic and Republican administrations, to utilize colored Americans in embassy posts. When Mr. Eisenhower first became President of the United States I got hold of a confidential analysis of the Negro in the Foreign Service from the Department of State files. This is not marked "classified" nor "security" and I am going to release portions of it for the first time because I hope that by doing so American public opinion will be goaded into action to do some good. Page 7 of that analysis is as follows:

The above report represents considerable progress after much diligent work by the Office of Personnel. However, it is admitted that there is much to be done before it can be said that the Department of State has hired nonwhites fully and fairly and has utilized them to best effect in various parts of the world. There are only 55 Negroes among the 8,231 persons employed abroad in the Foreign Service. There are only 15 Negroes with upper-grade classifications among the approximately 6,700 departmental employees grade 7 and above who are in Washington, D. C. Small progress has been made in the hiring of Americans of Asian descent. Only 7 are known to be employed both at home and abroad. Present outlook for employment opportunities in the Department of State is not good.

Now it is important to realize that I am quoting from a State Department document so there can be no arguments about any discussion later. I would like to continue now:

Some further idea of the importance of such employment (nonwhites) can be seen in the experience of United States delegations to the United Nations. The presence of Negro members in recent delegations to the General Assembly of the United Nations has been a source of good will and stimulated confidence in the United States. Moreover, the division of opinion on many issues in the United Nations Assembly, especially in relation to human rights has sometimes tended to follow a color line, white against non-white, with Russia seeking to be recognized as the champion of the nonwhites. In such situations, the assurance that Negro citizens of this country may be found among the employees and representatives of the Department is a source of strength to the United States in the presentation of its foreign policy and achievement of its objectives.

After almost a year and a half had gone by, Mr. George F. Wilson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel, wrote me from the Department of State:

I have your letter of April 8, 1954, regarding the employment of Negroes by the Department of State. I cannot make any observation on the accuracy of your figures as to the number of our Negro employees.

I was unable up until then and I have been unable since to find out what the picture is in the Department of State but I do know that if an analysis could



have been made by the Department of State in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, there is no reason why such an analysis could not be made now. In my White House conference with the President on May 11, I brought up this issue and I am happy to say that immediately he saw the psychological value of colored people serving in our embassies. After President Eisenhower instructed Mr. Maxwell Rabb, Secretary of the United States Cabinet, to confer with the State Department, an appointment was arranged. Mr. Rabb and I met with Mr. Loy Henderson, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Personnel, and although a year has passed, absolutely nothing has been done. This, I consider, open defiance of the President's orders.

Bandung has placed a time limit on indecision. It is absolutely impossible for the United States to continue to hope for any more support from the people of Asia and Africa if we continue to abstain on the question of colonialism before the United Nations. Congress on June 6, 1955, by record vote in the House of Representatives and Senate, estab-

lished the following as a part of our foreign policy:

[84th Cong., 1st sess. H. Con. Res. 153]

Whereas Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man; and

Whereas the people of the United States have traditionally supported other peoples in their aspirations to achieve self-government or independence and in their struggle against tyranny or domination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Despite the fact that the foregoing resolution on colonialism was passed by both Houses of the Congress and thus became the law of the land, our delegates to the United Nations completely ignored this as indicated by the following votes:

Issues	For	Against	Abstained	Vote of United States
Cyprus—U. N. Assembly consideration of self-determination, Sept. 23, 1955.	28	22	10	Against.
Algeria—Question of U. N. considering French administration, Sept. 30, 1955.	28	27	5	Do.
West New Guinea—Placing the question of West New Guinea on U. N. agenda, Oct. 3, 1955.	31	18	10	Abstained.
South Africa—On the question to continue a special commission on the racial situation in South Africa and proposal to continue consideration of the subject, Dec. 6, 1955.	41	6	8	Do.

I am, therefore, requesting the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and Senate to sharply question the appropriate officials as to why.

I recognize that Britain and France and other Western powers have for centuries stood at our side and fought with us, even though the fighting has oftentimes been our men fighting with them to protect their national sovereignty and integrity. I do not believe that for 1 minute we should turn our back upon these ancient allies. We should very vigorously and emphatically state that in Europe they are our allies and we can always be counted upon to give them the fullest measure of every kind of support.

I do believe that a historic break must be made and that we must just emphatically tell them that we can no longer support either with aid or with arms any form of imperialism sponsored by these nations in Asia and Africa. The cold stark fact confronts us that whether we take this stand or not, imperialism is finished. The natives, country by country are going to drive out the colonial powers and if we continue to stand with these powers on the question of colonialism then we are going to suffer diplomatic defeats. The full force of freedom is now sweeping over the earth and there are no powers that can stop it—short of a complete war of annihilation. This I don't believe the most rabid isolationist or warmonger would dare to suggest. From here on in the Western powers can no longer decide the fate of Asians and Africans without their leaders be-

ing present. There is a new group of powers in the world; the Eastern powers, and this group of powers wants to work in complete cooperation with us.

It is true that the United States has no colonies in Africa; yet we have a great responsibility as a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council, for the Trust Territories of the United Nations in Africa. The total population of these territories, excluding southwest Africa, is 15,433,339. The land area of these territories would be roughly comparable to all of New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

Since the establishment of the trusteeship system and the recognition of international responsibility for the freedom of dependent peoples, the United Nations has become the center of a struggle between the colonial powers, principally England, France, and Belgium, and the ex-colonial countries, principally India, Iraq, Egypt, Pakistan, and Indonesia. The colonial powers constantly seek to limit the scope of international responsibility under the charter and the ex-colonial powers ceaselessly attempt to broaden it. Probably no other subject has consumed more time or claimed more items on the agenda in the various meetings of the United Nations. The ex-colonial countries are highly responsive to any evidence that the colonial powers are not expediting the maturation of self-government within their colonies and trust territories. They feel a natural kinship with those people still in bondage.

The United States is one of the six administering powers in the Trusteeship Council. However, its territories are not as extensive and it is not traditionally a colonial power. Thus, in this power struggle, the United States has officially sought to take a middle moderating position between the colonial and ex-colonial points of view.

On the surface this seems like a correct policy. However, in practice, the weight of the United States has been preponderantly behind the colonial powers. The result has been that the ex-colonial countries have come to the conclusion that since the United States is generally found to be supporting the colonial power position where it really counts, that it, too, is a colonial power. The Russians have never lost an opportunity to make this point, for they are only too happy to drive a wedge between Asian and African countries and the United States.

A very important issue that has come up several times in Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly is that of target dates for self-government for trust territories. In two cases of Italian territories, Libya and Italian Somaliland, the General Assembly set actual dates for independence. As Italy was a defeated nation, her opposition to this was not taken seriously.

The suggestion that target dates be set for the other trust territories has been strenuously resisted by the colonial powers. In 1952 the General Assembly invited the administering authorities to give reports on measures taken to lead their trusts toward self-government and the period of time regarded as necessary to reach this goal. This request was repeated again in 1953, over the opposition of the administering powers, who opposed the recommendation on the grounds that it was impossible to foretell the date of independence. The United States abstained from this particular debate.

The issue was raised again in the 1955 report of the U. N. mission to Tanganyika which recommended that assurances be given to the people of Tanganyika that they would have their freedom within 20 to 25 years. The United States was a member of this mission and the United States representative initially supported this highly controversial recommendation. Under great pressure from the colonial powers, however, the United States reversed its support for such a target date. Clearly United States officials in principle support this policy of establishing target dates but find themselves overruled by the State Department, which regards this as a secondary issue but is under strong pressures from the colonial powers who regard it as a primary issue.

The United Nations Charter provisions on trusteeship did not make provisions for visiting missions. These missions have often been criticized by the administering powers for their inability to make profound judgments on the basis of a 6- to 8-week tour of a territory. The Trusteeship Council should, therefore, establish advisory councils in each trust territory. This would enable the Trusteeship Council to

play a more direct role in the supervision of the trust territories.

If the United States were to support the establishment of such advisory councils, the other administering powers would be hard put to refuse. This would be a highly strategic step for the United States to take at this time in expediting the movement toward self-government.

In the second place, racialism everywhere in the world must be speedily eradicated. This means that we must clean up our own house in the United States everywhere. The hard core of resistance based in the South must be dissolved. All Americans must become law-abiding citizens living according to the edicts of the Supreme Court, the orders of the President and the laws of our land. No Federal funds should go to any defiant State. In other words, stop subversion in our hearts and homes.

We must consider immediately the problem of South Africa and in the consideration of that problem we cannot afford, directly or indirectly, to allow the people there to think that we are in any way condoning the policies of segregation. If the rule of reason and order does not prevail, we should consider economic sanctions against the Boers. If the whole force of the United Nations is unanimously dedicated to eradicating racialism in the Union of South Africa, it will go. We need to realize that the Union of South Africa does not intend to stay within the British Commonwealth of Nations. They are anti-British and already they have announced that by 1958 they will withdraw and set up their own separate nation.

Thirdly, a thoroughgoing drastic reorganization of our Department of State, its Foreign Service, and all related activities should immediately take place. This is the showcase of America. Regardless of what we do within our borders, regardless of how we think, regardless of what public opinion may be unless the Department of State is actively projecting these things into the full arena of international diplomacy, international relationships, and international propaganda and education, then all we do here is nothing but sounding brass. The full impact of the American way of life in all its vast and progressively advancing fields is not being sold to the people of Asia and Africa. It is not being sold because there is a roadblock at the highest peak—and that roadblock is in the Department of State. The men in the Department of State are undoubtedly able and dedicated, but they are operating under the archaic 19th century system of evaluations and they are letting minor matters of protocol stand in the way of America giving the leadership the world so desperately and hungrily is demanding.

Mr. Dulles is our greatest deterrent. I suggest Stassen, Nelson Rockefeller, or Chester Bowles.

Fourthly, the Madison Avenue technique of selling is one of the great innovations of American life. This is the kind of technique that we need in the international field—bold, daring, new, fresh, vigorous, bringing a new impact each day, using every channel, every

resource, every bit of our strength. Being fully conscious of our weaknesses and fighting the idea of communism with our greatest strength: the greatest idea—the idea of democracy. The Western World should not condemn what it does not understand. India and Burma's neutralism should be approached by the West in a new light. These countries are primarily interested in economic development and secondarily in strong military defenses.

Russia has taken the initiative away from the United States in southeast Asia. They make every punch count. Russia has a propaganda policy. The United States has none. It is time for a change. We must keep up our good work in an area of economic aid, but we need to appropriate a certain amount of money to strategically placed things. For example, to use an extreme point of view, Billy Graham advocates giving a white Cadillac to Nehru for its sheer propaganda and news value.

In order for the United States to wage effective propaganda war in Asia we must have one on the home front. We must make our people ready to accept new concepts of neutralist nations. Instead of scorning Burma and India we should let the American people know that neutralism is not an enemy—it should not be regarded as an enemy, but friendly action. Home-front plans of propaganda should be followed by a plan of action which is well coordinated. We need a bipartisan foreign policy that really works to make it effective at home and abroad—we do not have this policy today. Dulles and his aides seem to have no understanding of those problems. Too often our foreign policy is geared for the home front and is totally unrealistic. We must prepare the United States before we can go to southeast Asia.

Whenever we give aid to southeast Asia, whenever possible it should be administered through Asians themselves because we must recognize the sensitivity of these peoples to colonialism. We must help them build themselves up to resist communism; we must find unobtrusive ways to get credit for what we do. We might give a million dollars in aid but we should appropriate a share for administration by Asians and some for show purposes. We must coordinate our aid to these countries with their own plans. There should be no strings to our help. Those not wanting aid could be given low interest loans if they want them.

We should contemplate long-range aid, not sporadic aid. We have failed to convey the idealism of America to these people. We have become satisfied. We, not Russia, were the revolutionaries which these countries hoped to model themselves after. Our callous feelings toward them have resulted in our failure to convey our idealism to them. We are a young country and have more anti-colonialism than any other power in the world. Russia is a colonial power—her satellites prove this. The United States holds the torch of liberty but we do not let these people see it. We do not sell our ideas properly.

Fifthly, we must recognize as we go out to fight communism in the East that it is not sufficient to have military alliances. Even if communism were completely destroyed the ancient problems of the East would still haunt them as fearsome specters—colonialism, disease, hunger, and illiteracy. What value the complete destruction of communism in Indonesia when the average income of an Indonesian for an entire year, in the year of our Lord and Bandung was only \$25?

What does it matter if communism is completely destroyed when the life expectancy for a man or a woman in India is only 32 years?

A foreign policy founded upon defeating communism alone may be of great value in the West but it is of very little value in the East. Yes, we must continue our fight against communism but we must expand our fight against the ancient problems of the East on all fronts.

Sixth, Africa is the No. 1 problem of our world. That dark, vast continent stretching for 5,000 miles is shaped like a question mark and it is. For there in Africa will be won or lost the world battle for freedom. This our Foreign Office is not aware of or, if so, is doing nothing about it. Communism in the West under the leadership of Soviet Russia and in the East under Red China is supposedly waving the flag of peace even if it is a little dirty and blood-stained. While they are doing this, north Africa and south Africa represent soft spots to establish new beachheads of subversion by Communist agents. We went to Africa centuries ago carrying a cross. It is time to go back to Africa again carrying an offer of full equality, dignity, mutual respect and direct and adequate assistance for social change. This is the only way to stop the wave of communism in Africa.

We need to channel as much of the aid that we give in Asia and Africa through international organizations. We know that the United Nations has a limited role but we should seek to build its strength through concrete demonstrations of our belief in its principles.

And lastly, with the full facts that I have presented indicating that the United States has no Far Eastern foreign policy except one founded on military alliances, let us for the first time in the history of the world sit down with the leaders of the people of Asia and Africa and work out an adequate Far Eastern policy.

This is the last thought that I left with President Eisenhower—why not be bold and daring and call an eight-power meeting in Manila in the Philippines. This would, in my own words to Mr. Eisenhower, "just about annihilate the propaganda of Red China." What a day it would be for the forces of democracy and of peace for the President of the United States to sit down with the leaders of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. This has never been done in all our history before. This alone proves the inadequacies of our foreign policy. The Presidents of the United States have



been holding historically for years Big Four, Big Five, and Big Six meetings all over Europe but never have they held a meeting with the leaders of Asia and Africa. Bandung was an invitation for this. I and members of the press talked to chiefs of these states and they indicated that they would be extremely well disposed to meet for a summit talk in

the East. Gen. Carlos Romulo on Meet the Press on Sunday, May 8, said:

The President of the United States should come to the East and talk to the Asian leaders.

There is not much time left to do this. The world is moving with a startling rapidity that transcends not only the visual but even the imaginative. With

our Yankee courage, our Madison Avenue know-how, our Christian heritage and the bulwark of the Bill of Rights, in back of us, using our 25 million colored citizens as a spearhead, we can launch a drive for peace and for full equality now in the Far East. Only through such a bold maneuver can we win. History will pass us by if we do not.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, guardian of these pilgrim days, the hurrying pace of our fleeting years frightens and awes us. Strained and tense with the pressures of our burdened lives we seek the shelter and strength that undergirds us, as Thy completeness flows round our incompleteness. As for this moment of quiet we look away from ourselves and our tasks to Thee, Thou judge of all men, strip us, we beseech Thee, of our disabling illusions, chasten us for our willful blindness. In the performance of this day's duties may we ascend the hill of the Lord with pure hearts and clean hands. In a tangled and tragic day lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

As comrades of like passions as ourselves walk by our side, make us tolerant and charitable in our attitudes to those who may differ from us in conviction and opinion. As sometimes we may question their judgment, save us from impugning without cause their sincerity and integrity. We ask it in the name of that One who warns us: Judge not, that ye be not judged. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAYNE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 18, 1956, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 18, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Ryder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

### REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States: In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 19, 1956.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the

Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Armed Services were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Minerals, Materials, and Fuel Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.